Ergodic Theory Meets Polarization. I: An Ergodic Theory for Binary Operations

Rajai Nasser
School of Computer and Communication Sciences, EPFL
Lausanne, Switzerland
Email: rajai.nasser@epfl.ch

arXiv:1406.2943v4 [math.CO] 3 Feb 2015

Abstract

An open problem in polarization theory is to determine the binary operations that always lead to polarization when they are used in Arıkan style constructions. This paper, which is presented in two parts, solves this problem by providing a necessary and sufficient condition for a binary operation to be polarizing. This (first) part of the paper introduces the mathematical framework that we will use in the second part [1] to characterize the polarizing operations. We define uniformity preserving, irreducible, ergodic and strongly ergodic operations and we study their properties. The concepts of a stable partition and the residue of a stable partition are introduced. We show that an ergodic operation is strongly ergodic if and only if all its stable partitions are their own residues. We also study the products of binary operations and the structure of their stable partitions. We show that the product of a sequence of binary operations is strongly ergodic if and only if all the operations in the sequence are strongly ergodic. In the second part of the paper, we provide a foundation of polarization theory based on the ergodic theory of binary operations that we develop in this part.

I. Introduction

Polar codes are a class of codes invented by Arıkan [2] which achieves the capacity of symmetric binary-input memoryless channels with low encoding and decoding complexities. Arıkan and Telatar showed that the probability of error of the successive cancellation decoder of polar codes is equal to $o(2^{-N^{1/2-\epsilon}})$ [3].

Arıkan's construction is based on a basic transformation that is applied recursively. The basic transformation starts with two identical and independent copies of a single user channel W and transforms them to two channels W^- and W^+ such that $I(W^-) + I(W^+) = 2I(W)$, which means that the total capacity is preserved. It is shown that if W is not extremal, i.e., if $0 < I(W) < \log 2$, then W^- (resp. W^+) is strictly worse (resp. strictly better) than W. This fact was used to show that if we apply the basic transformation recursively, we can convert a set of identical and independent copies of a given single user binary-input channel, into a set of "almost perfect" and "almost useless" channels while preserving the total capacity. This phenomenon is called *polarization* and it is used to construct capacity-achieving polar codes.

Arıkan's basic construction uses the XOR operation. Therefore, any attempt to generalize Arıkan's technique to channels having a non-binary input alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, has to replace the XOR operation by a binary operation $*$ on the input alphabet $\mathcal{X}$. The first operation that was investigated is the addition modulo q, where $q = |\mathcal{X}|$ and $\mathcal{X}$ is endowed with the algebraic structure $\mathbb{Z}_q$. Şaşoğlu et al. [4] showed that if q is prime, then the addition modulo q leads to the same polarization phenomenon as in the binary input case.

Park and Barg [5] showed that if $q = 2^r$ with $r > 0$, then the addition modulo q leads to a polarization phenomenon which is different from the polarization in the binary input case, but it can still be used to construct capacity-achieving polar codes. They showed that we have a multilevel polarization: while we do not always have polarization to "almost perfect" or "almost useless" channels, we always have polarization to channels which are easy to use for communication. Sahebi and Pradhan [6] showed that multilevel polarization also happens if any Abelian group operation on the alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ is used. This allows the construction of polar codes for arbitrary discrete memoryless channels (DMC) since any alphabet can be endowed with an Abelian group structure.

Polar codes for arbitrary DMCs were also constructed by Şaşoğlu [7] using a special quasigroup operation which ensures two-level polarization. The author and Telatar have shown in [8] that all quasigroup operations are polarizing (in the general multilevel sense) and can be used to construct capacity-achieving polar codes for arbitrary DMCs [9].

Quasigroups are the largest class of binary operations that is known to be polarizing. This paper, which is presented in two parts, determines all the polarizing operations by providing a necessary and sufficient condition for a binary operation to be polarizing. This part introduces the mathematical framework that we will use in the second part [1] to characterize the polarizing operations.

In section II we introduce the notion of uniformity preserving operations. A *uniformity preserving operation* $*$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is a binary operation such that the mapping $f_* : \mathcal{X}^2 \to \mathcal{X}^2$ defined by $f_*(x, y) = (x*y, y)$ is bijective. It is called uniformity preserving since for any pair of random variables (X_1, X_2) in $\mathcal{X}^2$, $(X_1 * X_2, X_2)$ is uniform in $\mathcal{X}^2$ if and only if (X_1, X_2) is uniform in $\mathcal{X}^2$. As we will see in [1], if $*$ is not uniformity preserving, then the Arıkan style construction that is based on $*$ does not conserve the symmetric capacity. Hence being uniformity preserving is a necessary condition to be polarizing. On the other hand, being a quasigroup operation is a sufficient condition [8]. Therefore, a necessary and sufficient condition must be a property that is stronger than uniformity preserving and weaker than quasigroup. A reasonable strategy to search for a necessary and sufficient condition is to relax the quasigroup property while keeping the uniformity preserving property.

The difference between a quasigroup operation and a uniformity preserving operation is that in the case of a quasigroup operation, any element is reachable from any other element by one multiplication on the right. This property does not always hold for a uniformity preserving operation.

One possible relaxation of the quasigroup property is to consider uniformity preserving operations where all the elements are reachable from each other by multiple multiplications on the right. Irreducible and ergodic operations — which are defined and studied in section III — satisfy this property. The concepts of irreducible and ergodic operations are very similar to the concepts of irreducible and ergodic Markov chains. The reason why we consider such binary operations is because of their good connectability properties: if the elements of $\mathcal{X}$ are well connected under $*$, this will create strong correlations between the inputs of the synthetic channels which should ultimately lead to a polarization phenomenon.

Although ergodic operations seem to have good connectability properties, this is not enough to ensure polarization as we will see in Part II [1]. It turns out that we need a stronger notion of ergodicity. But in order to define this stronger notion of ergodicity, we first need to define stable partitions. Section IV introduces balanced, periodic and stable partitions and investigates their properties. Stable partitions are a generalization of the concept of quotient groups. In section V, we introduce and study the notion of the residue of a stable partition and in section VI we define and investigate strongly ergodic operations. We show that an ergodic operation is strongly ergodic if and only if each stable partition is its own residue. Strong ergodicity is a novel concept and does not have a similar concept in the ergodic theory of Markov chains. We will show in Part II [1] that a binary operation is polarizing if and only if it is uniformity preserving and its inverse is strongly ergodic.

Generated stable partitions are introduced and studied in section VII. This concept is needed to show that the strong ergodicity of the inverse operation is a sufficient condition for polarization.

The products of binary operations are defined in section VIII and the structure of their stable partitions is studied. We show that the product of a sequence of binary operations is strongly ergodic if and only if every operation in the sequence is strongly ergodic. The products of binary operations and their stable partitions are important for the study of polarization theory for multiple access channels [1].

II. Uniformity preserving operations

All the sets that are considered in this paper are finite.

Definition 1. *A* uniformity preserving operation $*$ *on* $\mathcal{X}$ *is a binary operation such that the mapping* $f_* : \mathcal{X}^2 \to \mathcal{X}^2$ *defined by* $f_*(x, y) = (x * y, y)$ *is bijective. It is called uniformity preserving since for*

any pair of random variables (X_1, X_2) in $\mathcal{X}^2$, $(X_1 * X_2, X_2)$ is uniform in $\mathcal{X}^2$ if and only if (X_1, X_2) is uniform in $\mathcal{X}^2$.

Remark 1. *It is easy to see that $*$ is uniformity preserving if and only if it satisfies the following condition:*

- *For any two elements $a, b \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a unique element $c \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $a = c * b$. We denote this element c by $a/^* b$.*

In other words, $*$ is uniformity preserving if and only if the mappings $\pi_b : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ defined by $\pi_b(x) = x * b$ are bijective for all $b \in \mathcal{X}$. It is easy to see that if $*$ is uniformity preserving then $/^*$ is uniformity preserving as well. The operation $/^*$ is called the inverse *of $*$.*

Definition 2. *A uniformity preserving operation is said to be a quasigroup operation if it also satisfies the following:*

- *For any two elements $a, b \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a unique element $c \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $a = b * c$. We denote this element c by $b \backslash_* a$.*

It is easy to see that if $*$ is a quasigroup operation then $/^*$ and $\backslash_*$ are quasigroup operations as well.

Notation 1. *Let A and B be two subsets of $\mathcal{X}$. We define the set:*

$$A * B := \{a * b : \ a \in A, b \in B\}.$$

For $a, b \in \mathcal{X}$, we denote $\{a\} * B$ and $A * \{b\}$ by $a * B$ and $A * b$ respectively.

It is easy to see that if $*$ is uniformity preserving and B is non-empty, then $|A * B| \geq |A|$. On the other hand, the relation $|A * B| \geq |B|$ does not hold in general unless $*$ is a quasigroup operation and A is non-empty.

III. Irreducible and ergodic operations

In this section and throughout the paper, $*$ is always a uniformity preserving operation.

Definition 3. *Let $*$ be a uniformity preserving operation on a set $\mathcal{X}$. We say that $a \in \mathcal{X}$ is $*$-connectable to $b \in \mathcal{X}$ in l-steps if there exist l elements $x_0, \ldots, x_{l-1} \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $(\ldots((a * x_0) * x_1) \ldots * x_{l-1}) = b$. We denote this relation by $a \xrightarrow{*,l} b$.*

We say that a is $*$-connectable to b if there exists $l > 0$ such that $a \xrightarrow{*,l} b$, we denote this relation by $a \xrightarrow{*} b$.

Definition 4. *A uniformity preserving operation $*$ is said to be* irreducible *if all the elements of $\mathcal{X}$ are $*$-connectable to each other. If $*$ is irreducible, we define the period of an element $a \in \mathcal{X}$ as $\mathrm{per}(*, a) := \gcd\{l > 0 : \ a \xrightarrow{*,l} a\}$, and we define the period of $*$ as:*

$$\mathrm{per}(*) := \gcd\left\{\mathrm{per}(*, a) : \ a \in \mathcal{X}\right\} = \gcd\left\{l > 0 : \ \exists a \in \mathcal{X}, a \xrightarrow{*,l} a\right\}.$$

If there exists $l > 0$ such that all the elements of $\mathcal{X}$ are $*$-connectable to each other in l steps, we say that the operation $*$ is ergodic. *In this case, we call the minimum integer $l > 0$ which satisfies this property the* connectability *of the operation $*$, and we denote it by $\mathrm{con}(*)$.*

Remark 2. *In order to justify our choice of terminology in the previous definition, consider a sequence $(X'_n)_{n\geq 0}$ of independent and uniformly distributed random variables in $\mathcal{X}$. Define $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ recursively as follows: $X_0 = X'_0$ and $X_n = X_{n-1} * X'_n$ for $n > 1$. It is easy to see that $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is a stationary Markov chain. We have the following:*

- *$*$ is irreducible if and only if $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is irreducible.*
- *$*$ is ergodic if and only if $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is ergodic.*

Proposition 1. *We have the following:*

1) *Every quasigroup operation is ergodic, and every ergodic operation is irreducible.*
2) *If $*$ is uniformity preserving but not irreducible, there exists two disjoint non-empty subsets A_1 and A_2 of $\mathcal{X}$ such that $A_1 \cup A_2 = \mathcal{X}$, $A_1 * \mathcal{X} = A_1$ and $A_2 * \mathcal{X} = A_2$.*
3) *If $*$ is irreducible, we have $\mathrm{per}(*, a) = \mathrm{per}(*)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{X}$.*
4) *If $*$ is irreducible, there exists a partition $\mathcal{E}_*$ of $\mathcal{X}$ containing $n = \mathrm{per}(*)$ subsets $H_0, \ldots, H_{n-1}$ such that $H_i * \mathcal{X} = H_{i+1 \bmod n}$ for all $0 \leq i < n$. Moreover, we have $|H_0| = \ldots = |H_{n-1}|$.*
5) *If $*$ is irreducible, there exists an integer $d > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq i < n = \mathrm{per}(*)$, any element of H_i is $*$-connectable to any element of $H_{i+d \bmod n}$ in d steps. We call the least integer $d > 0$ satisfying this property the* connectability *of the irreducible operation $*$ and we denote it $\mathrm{con}(*)$ (This definition is consistent with the definition of the connectability of ergodic operations. I.e., the connectability of an ergodic operation when it is seen as an irreducible operation is the same as its connectability when it is seen as an ergodic operation).*
6) *If $*$ is irreducible, then for every $s \geq \mathrm{con}(*)$ and every $0 \leq i < n = \mathrm{per}(*)$, any element of H_i is $*$-connectable to any element of $H_{i+s \bmod n}$ in s steps.*
7) *If $*$ is irreducible, $\mathrm{per}(*) = 1$ if and only if $*$ is ergodic.*
8) *If $*$ is ergodic, all the elements of $\mathcal{X}$ are $*$-connectable to each other in s-steps for any $s \geq \mathrm{con}(*)$.*
9) *If $*$ is ergodic, $\mathrm{con}(*) = 1$ if and only if $*$ is a quasigroup operation.*
10) *If $*$ is irreducible (resp. ergodic), then $/^*$ is irreducible (resp. ergodic) as well.*

Proof: 1) Trivial: For a quasigroup operation, all the elements of $\mathcal{X}$ are $*$-connectable to each other in one step.

2) Suppose that $*$ is uniformity preserving but not irreducible, there exists two elements a_1 and a_2 of $\mathcal{X}$ such that a_1 is not $*$-connectable to a_2. Let $A_1 = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \ a_1 \xrightarrow{*} x\}$ and $A_2 = \mathcal{X} \setminus A_1$. Clearly, $a_1 * a_1 \in A_1$ and $a_2 \in A_2$. Therefore, A_1 and A_2 are two disjoint non-empty sets such that $A_1 \cup A_2 = \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, we have $A_1 * \mathcal{X} \subset A_1$ from the definition of A_1. Now since $|A_1 * \mathcal{X}| \geq |A_1|$, we must have $A_1 * \mathcal{X} = A_1$.

For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, define $\pi_x : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ as $\pi_x(a) = a * x$ for all $a \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $*$ is uniformity preserving, π_x is bijective for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Therefore, $|\pi_x(A_1)| = |A_1|$. On the other hand, $\pi_x(A_1) = A_1 * x \subset A_1 * \mathcal{X} = A_1$. This means that $\pi_x(A_1) = A_1$, which implies that $\pi_x(A_2) = \pi_x(\mathcal{X} \setminus A_1) = \mathcal{X} \setminus A_1 = A_2$ since π_x is bijective. Therefore, $A_2 * x = A_2$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, hence $A_2 * \mathcal{X} = A_2$.

3) Suppose that $*$ is irreducible, and let $a, b \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $*$ is irreducible, there exists $l_1, l_2 \geq 0$ such that $a \xrightarrow{*,l_1} b$ and $b \xrightarrow{*,l_2} a$, so $a \xrightarrow{*,l_1+l_2} a$ which means that $\mathrm{per}(*, a)$ divides $l_1 + l_2$. Now for any integer $l > 0$ satisfying $b \xrightarrow{*,l} b$, we have that $a \xrightarrow{*,l_1+l+l_2} a$. This shows that $\mathrm{per}(*, a)$ divides $l_1 + l_2 + l$, which implies that $\mathrm{per}(*, a)$ divides l since we have just shown that $\mathrm{per}(*, a)$ divides $l_1 + l_2$. But this is true for any $l > 0$ satisfying $b \xrightarrow{*,l} b$. We conclude that $\mathrm{per}(*, a)$ divides $\mathrm{per}(*, b)$. Similarly, we can show that $\mathrm{per}(*, b)$ divides $\mathrm{per}(*, a)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{per}(*, a)$ is the same for all $a \in \mathcal{X}$. Now since $\mathrm{per}(*) = \gcd\{\mathrm{per}(*, a) : \ a \in \mathcal{X}\}$, we have $\mathrm{per}(*) = \mathrm{per}(*, a)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{X}$.

4) Suppose that $*$ is irreducible and let $n = \mathrm{per}(*)$. Fix $a \in \mathcal{X}$ and define the subsets $H_0, \ldots, H_{n-1}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ as follows: for each $0 \leq i < n$, $H_i = \left\{x \in \mathcal{X} : \ \exists l > 0, \ a \xrightarrow{*,l} x \text{ and } l \equiv i \bmod n\right\}$. We have the following:

- If $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then $a \xrightarrow{*,l_{a,x}} x$ for some integer $l_{a,x} > 0$ because of irreducibility. This shows that for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $x \in H_{l_{a,x} \bmod n} \subset \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} H_i \subset \mathcal{X}$. Therefore, $\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} H_i = \mathcal{X}$.
- Let $x \in H_i$ and $y \in H_j$. We have $a \xrightarrow{*,l_{a,x}} x$ for some $l_{a,x} > 0$ satisfying $l_{a,x} \equiv i \bmod n$. Moreover, $x \xrightarrow{*,l_{x,a}} a$ for some $l_{x,a} > 0$, and so $a \xrightarrow{*,l_{a,x}+l_{x,a}} a$. The definition of $\mathrm{per}(*)$ implies that n divides $l_{a,x} + l_{x,a}$ and so $l_{x,a} \equiv -i \bmod n$. Now since $y \in H_j$, we have $a \xrightarrow{*,l_{a,y}} y$ for some $l_{a,y} > 0$ satisfying

$l_{a,y} \equiv j \bmod n$. We conclude that $x \xrightarrow{*,l_{x,y}} y$ where $l_{x,y} = l_{x,a} + l_{a,y} \equiv j - i \bmod n$.

- Suppose there exists $i \neq j$ such that $H_i \cap H_j \neq \emptyset$ and let $x \in H_i \cap H_j$, then $x \xrightarrow{*,l_{x,x}} x$, where $l_{x,x} \equiv j - i \not\equiv 0 \bmod n$. The definition of $\mathrm{per}(*)$ implies that n divides $l_{x,x}$ which is a contradiction since $l_{x,x} \not\equiv 0 \bmod n$. We conclude that $H_i \cap H_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$.
- For any $0 \leq i < n$ and any $y \in H_i * \mathcal{X}$, there exist $x \in H_i$ and $z \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $y = x * z$, which implies that $y \in H_{i+1 \bmod n}$. Therefore $H_i * \mathcal{X} \subset H_{i+1 \bmod n}$, and so $|H_{i+1 \bmod n}| \geq |H_i * \mathcal{X}| \geq |H_i|$. Thus, $|H_0| \geq |H_{n-1}| \geq \ldots |H_1| \geq |H_0|$, which implies that $|H_0| = |H_1| = \ldots = |H_{n-1}|$.

Therefore, $\{H_0, \ldots, H_{n-1}\}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{X}$ satisfying $|H_0| = |H_1| = \ldots = |H_{n-1}|$.

5) For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and every $j > 0$ define

$$K_{x,j} = \left\{ y \in \mathcal{X} : \; x \xrightarrow{*,j} y \right\}.$$

Since $K_{x,j+1} = K_{x,j} * \mathcal{X}$ and since the number of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ is finite, there exists $d_x > 0$ such that the sequence $(K_{x,j})_{j \geq d_x}$ is periodic. Let per_x be the period of $(K_{x,j})_{j \geq d_x}$. Now since $K_{x,j+1} = K_{x,j} * \mathcal{X}$, we have $|K_{x,j+1}| \geq |K_{x,j}|$. Therefore the sequence $(|K_{x,j}|)_{j \geq d_x}$ is both periodic and non-decreasing, which implies that it is constant.

Fix $j \geq d_x$, and let $l > 0$ be such that $x \xrightarrow{*,l} x$. For every $x' \in K_{x,j}$ we have $x \xrightarrow{*,j} x'$ which implies that $x \xrightarrow{*,l+j} x'$ (since $x \xrightarrow{*,l} x$) and so $x' \in K_{x,j+l}$. Therefore, $K_{x,j} \subset K_{x,j+l}$, which implies that $K_{x,j} = K_{x,j+l}$ (since we know that $|K_{x,j}| = |K_{x,j+l}|$). Now since this is true for any $j \geq d_x$, we conclude that per_x divides every $l > 0$ satisfying $x \xrightarrow{*,l} x$. Therefore, per_x divides $\gcd\{l > 0 : \; x \xrightarrow{*,l} x\} = \mathrm{per}(*, x) = n$. Hence,

$$K_{x,j} = K_{x,j+kn} \text{ for all } j \geq d_x \text{ and all } k \geq 0. \tag{1}$$

For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let i_x be the unique index $0 \leq i_x < n$ satisfying $x \in H_{i_x}$. Clearly, $K_{x,j} \subset H_{i_x+j \bmod n}$. Now let $x' \in K_{x,j}$ and $x'' \in H_{i_x+j \bmod n}$, where $j \geq d_x$. Since both x' and x'' are in $H_{i_x+j \bmod n}$, we know from the discussion of the fourth point that we have $x' \xrightarrow{*,l_{x',x''}} x''$ for some $l_{x',x''} \equiv 0 \bmod n$. Since n divides $l_{x',x''}$, we have $K_{x,j+l_{x',x''}} = K_{x,j}$ from (1). Now since $x' \in K_{x,j}$ and $x' \xrightarrow{*,l_{x',x''}} x''$, we have $x'' \in K_{x,j+l_{x',x''}} = K_{x,j}$. But this is true for every $x'' \in H_{i_x+j \bmod n}$. Therefore, $H_{i_x+j \bmod n} \subset K_{x,j}$, which implies that $K_{x,j} = H_{i_x+j \bmod n}$ as we already have $K_{x,j} \subset H_{i_x+j \bmod n}$.

Define $d = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_x$. Let $0 \leq i < n$ and $x \in H_i$. We have $i_x = i$ (since $x \in H_i$) and $d \geq d_x$. Therefore, from the above discussion we have $H_{i+d \bmod n} = H_{i_x+d \bmod n} = K_{x,d}$. Hence, for every $y \in H_{i+d \bmod n}$, we have $y \in K_{x,d}$ and so $x \xrightarrow{*,d} y$.

6) We will prove the claim by induction on $s \geq \mathrm{con}(*)$. If $s = \mathrm{con}(*)$, the claim follows from 5). Now let $s > \mathrm{con}(*)$ and suppose that the claim is true for $s - 1$. Let $0 \leq i < n$, $x \in H_i$ and $y \in H_{i+s \bmod n}$. Since $H_{i+s \bmod n} = H_{i+s-1 \bmod n} * \mathcal{X}$, there exists $y' \in H_{i+s-1 \bmod n}$ such that $y' \xrightarrow{*,1} y$. Now since $y' \in H_{i+s-1 \bmod n}$, it follows from the induction hypothesis that $x \xrightarrow{*,s-1} y'$. Therefore, $x \xrightarrow{*,s} y$.

7) Let $*$ be an irreducible operations of period $\mathrm{per}(*) = 1$. Let $\mathcal{E}_*$ be the partition defined in 4). Since $\mathrm{per}(*) = 1$, the partition $\mathcal{E}_*$ contains only one element H_0 which must be $\mathcal{X}$. Now 5) implies that there exists $d > 0$ such that any element of $\mathcal{X} = H_0$ is $*$-connectable to any element of $H_{0+d \bmod 1} = H_0 = \mathcal{X}$ in d steps. Therefore, $*$ is ergodic.

Conversely, if $*$ is ergodic, let $d = \mathrm{con}(*)$ and $n = \mathrm{per}(*)$. Define $\mathcal{E}_* = \{H_0, \ldots, H_{n-1}\}$ as in 4) and let $a \in H_0$. Since $a \xrightarrow{*,d} x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then $\mathcal{X} \subset H_{d \bmod n}$ which implies that $\mathcal{X} = H_{d \bmod n}$. Now since $|H_0| = \ldots = |H_{n-1}| = |H_{d \bmod n}| = |\mathcal{X}|$, then $H_0 = \ldots = H_{n-1} = \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{E}_* = \{\mathcal{X}\}$. Therefore, $\mathrm{per}(*) = n = |\mathcal{E}_*| = 1$.

8) If $*$ is ergodic, then $\mathrm{per}(*) = 1$ by 7). Therefore, $\mathcal{E}_*$ contains only one element H_0 which must be $\mathcal{X}$. Now 6) implies that for every $s \geq \mathrm{con}(*)$, any element of $\mathcal{X} = H_0$ is $*$-connectable to any element

of $H_{0+s \bmod 1} = H_0 = \mathcal{X}$ in s steps.

9) and 10) are trivial. ■

IV. Balanced, periodic and stable partitions

Notation 2. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a set of subsets of a set $\mathcal{X}$, we define the following:*

- $||\mathcal{H}||_\wedge = \min_{H\in\mathcal{H}} |H|$.
- $||\mathcal{H}||_\vee = \max_{H\in\mathcal{H}} |H|$.

Definition 5. *A partition $\mathcal{H}$ of a set $\mathcal{X}$ is said to be a* balanced partition *if all the elements of $\mathcal{H}$ have the same size. We denote the common size of its elements by $||\mathcal{H}||$. The number of elements in $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted by $|\mathcal{H}|$. Clearly, $|\mathcal{X}| = |\mathcal{H}| \cdot ||\mathcal{H}||$ and $||\mathcal{H}|| = ||\mathcal{H}||_\wedge = ||\mathcal{H}||_\vee$ for such a partition.*

Definition 6. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a partition of a set $\mathcal{X}$. We define the* projection onto $\mathcal{H}$ *as the mapping $\mathrm{Proj}_\mathcal{H} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathrm{Proj}_\mathcal{H}(x)$ is the unique element $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $x \in H$.*

Notation 3. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be two sets of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$. We define $\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}$ as follows:*

$$\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B} = \{A * B :\ A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Definition 7. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a set of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$, and let $*$ be a uniformity preserving operation on $\mathcal{X}$. We define the set $\mathcal{H}^* = \mathcal{H} * \mathcal{H} = \{A * B :\ A, B \in \mathcal{H}\}$, and we define the sequence $(\mathcal{H}^{n*})_{n\geq 0}$ recursively as follows:*

- $\mathcal{H}^{0*} = \mathcal{H}$.
- $\mathcal{H}^{n*} := (\mathcal{H}^{(n-1)*})^* = \mathcal{H}^{(n-1)*} * \mathcal{H}^{(n-1)*}$ *for all $n > 0$.*

Definition 8. *A partition $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ is said to be a* periodic partition *of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ if there exists $n > 0$ such that $\mathcal{H}^{n*} = \mathcal{H}$. In this case, the minimum integer $n > 0$ which satisfies $\mathcal{H}^{n*} = \mathcal{H}$ is called the* period *of $\mathcal{H}$, and it is denoted by $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$.*

A partition $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ is said to be a stable partition *of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ if $\mathcal{H}$ is both balanced and periodic.*

Throughout the paper, we write that $\mathcal{H}$ is a periodic (resp. stable) partition of $\mathcal{X}$ if the binary operation $*$ is clear from the context.

Example 1. *Let $Q = \mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n$, define $(x_1, y_1) * (x_2, y_2) = (x_1 + y_1 + x_2 + y_2, y_1 + y_2)$ which is a quasigroup operation. For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ and each $0 \leq i < n$, define $H_{i,j} = \{(j + ik, k) :\ k \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$. Let $\mathcal{H}_i = \{H_{i,j} :\ j \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$ for $0 \leq i < n$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{H}_i^* = \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$ for $0 \leq i < n-1$ and $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}^* = \mathcal{H}_0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}_0$ is a periodic partition of $(Q, *)$ and $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) = n$. Moreover, $\mathcal{H}$ is balanced with $||\mathcal{H}|| = n$, hence $\mathcal{H}$ is a stable partition.*

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a periodic partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$. For every $n > 0$, $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ is a periodic partition and has the same period as $\mathcal{H}$, i.e., $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}^{n*}) = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$.*

Proof: For every $k > 0$ and every sequence $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}^*$, …, $H_{k-1} \in \mathcal{H}^{(k-1)*}$, define

$$\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{k-1}} := \big\{(\ldots((H * H_0) * H_1)\ldots * H_{k-1}) :\ H \in \mathcal{H}\big\}. \tag{2}$$

We have:

$$\bigcup_{X\in\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{k-1}}} X = \bigcup_{H\in\mathcal{H}} (\ldots((H * H_0) * H_1)\ldots * H_{k-1}) = \Big(\ldots\Big(\Big(\Big(\bigcup_{H\in\mathcal{H}} H\Big) * H_0\Big) * H_1\Big)\ldots * H_{k-1}\Big)$$
$$= (\ldots((\mathcal{X} * H_0) * H_1)\ldots * H_{k-1}) = \mathcal{X}.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{k-1}}$ covers $\mathcal{X}$ for any sequence $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}^*$, …, $H_{k-1} \in \mathcal{H}^{(k-1)*}$. Moreover, it is easy to see from (2) that $\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{k-1}} \subset \mathcal{H}^{k*}$, which implies that $\mathcal{H}^{k*}$ covers $\mathcal{X}$.

Fix $n > 0$ and suppose that $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ is not a partition. Since we have shown that $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ covers $\mathcal{X}$, there must exist $X_1, X_1' \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}$ such that $X_1 \cap X_1' \neq \emptyset$ and $X_1 \neq X_1'$. We may assume without loss of generality that $|X_1| \leq |X_1'|$. If $X_1' \setminus X_1 = \emptyset$ then $X_1' \subset X_1$ which implies that $X_1' = X_1$ (because $|X_1| \leq |X_1'|$) which is a contradiction. Therefore, we must have $X_1' \setminus X_1 \neq \emptyset$.

Since $X_1 \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}$, there exists $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and a sequence $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}^*$, ..., $H_{n-1} \in \mathcal{H}^{(n-1)*}$ such that $X_1 = (\ldots((H * H_0) * H_1)\ldots * H_{n-1})$ which implies that $X_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{n-1}}$. Now since we have shown that $\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{n-1}}$ covers $\mathcal{X}$ and since $X_1' \setminus X_1 \neq \emptyset$, there must exist $X_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{n-1}}$ such that $X_2 \cap (X_1' \setminus X_1) \neq \emptyset$. Clearly, $X_1 \neq X_2$ since $X_1 \cap (X_1' \setminus X_1) = \emptyset$ and $X_2 \cap (X_1' \setminus X_1) \neq \emptyset$.

Let $p > 0$ be the smallest multiple of $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ which is greater than n, i.e.,

$$p = \min\{k \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) :\ k > 0,\ k \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) > n\}.$$

We have $\mathcal{H}^{p*} = \mathcal{H}$ since $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ divides p. Fix $H_n \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}, H_{n+1} \in \mathcal{H}^{(n+1)*}, \ldots, H_{p-1} \in \mathcal{H}^{(p-1)*}$ and define:

- $A = (\ldots((X_1 * H_n) * H_{n+1})\ldots * H_{p-1}) \in \mathcal{H}^{p*} = \mathcal{H}$.
- $B = (\ldots((X_2 * H_n) * H_{n+1})\ldots * H_{p-1}) \in \mathcal{H}^{p*} = \mathcal{H}$.
- $C = (\ldots((X_1' * H_n) * H_{n+1})\ldots * H_{p-1}) \in \mathcal{H}^{p*} = \mathcal{H}$.

We have $X_1 \cap X_1' \neq \emptyset$ and $X_2 \cap X_1' \neq \emptyset$, which imply that $A \cap C \neq \emptyset$ and $B \cap C \neq \emptyset$. Now since A, B, C are members of $\mathcal{H}$ which is a partition, we must have $A = B = C$. We conclude that

$$(\ldots((X_1 * H_n) * H_{n+1})\ldots * H_{p-1}) \ = \ (\ldots((X_2 * H_n) * H_{n+1})\ldots * H_{p-1}). \tag{3}$$

We have:

- $\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{p-1}} \subset \mathcal{H}^{p*}$ from the definition of $\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{p-1}}$ (see (2)). We have shown that $\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{p-1}}$ covers $\mathcal{X}$ and we know that $\mathcal{H}^{p*} = \mathcal{H}$ is a partition. Therefore, we must have $\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{p-1}} = \mathcal{H}^{p*} = \mathcal{H}$.
- The mapping $\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{n-1}} \to \mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{p-1}}$ defined by $X \to (\ldots((X * H_n) * H_{n+1})\ldots * H_{p-1})$ is surjective but not injective because of (3). This implies that $|\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{p-1}}| < |\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{n-1}}|$.
- The mapping $\mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{n-1}}$ defined by $H \to (\ldots((H * H_0) * H_1)\ldots * H_{n-1})$ is surjective. Therefore, $|\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{n-1}}| \leq |\mathcal{H}|$.

We conclude that $|\mathcal{H}| = |\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{p-1}}| < |\mathcal{H}_{H_0,\ldots,H_{n-1}}| \leq |\mathcal{H}|$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ must be a partition. On the other hand, we have, $(\mathcal{H}^{n*})^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})*} = (\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})*})^{n*} = \mathcal{H}^{n*}$ which implies that $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ is a periodic partition of period $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}^{n*}) \leq \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$. But since $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{p*} = (\mathcal{H}^{n*})^{(p-n)*}$, we must also have $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}^{p*}) \leq \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}^{n*})$. Therefore, $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}^{n*}) = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ for every $n > 0$. ■

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a periodic partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$. For every $H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{H}^* = \mathcal{H} * \{H_2\} = \{H_1 * H_2 :\ H_1 \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

Proof: For every $H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, we have:

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X} * H_2 = \Big(\bigcup_{H_1 \in \mathcal{H}} H_1\Big) * H_2 = \bigcup_{H_1 \in \mathcal{H}} (H_1 * H_2).$$

Therefore, the set $\{H_1 * H_2 :\ H_1 \in \mathcal{H}\}$ covers $\mathcal{X}$ and it is a subset of $\mathcal{H}^*$ which is a partition of $\mathcal{X}$ by Proposition 2. Therefore, we must have $\mathcal{H}^* = \{H_1 * H_2 :\ H_1 \in \mathcal{H}\}$. ■

Proposition 3. *If $\mathcal{H}$ is a periodic partition then $|\mathcal{H}^{n*}| = |\mathcal{H}|$ for every $n > 0$.*

Proof: For every $l \geq 0$, Proposition 2 shows that $\mathcal{H}^{l*}$ is a periodic partition. If we fix $H_2 \in \mathcal{H}^{l*}$, then we have $\mathcal{H}^{(l+1)*} = \{H_1 * H_2 :\ H_1 \in \mathcal{H}^{l*}\}$ by Lemma 1. Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{H}^{(l+1)*}| = \big|\{H_1 * H_2 :\ H_1 \in \mathcal{H}^{l*}\}\big| \leq \big|\{H_1 :\ H_1 \in \mathcal{H}^{l*}\}\big| = |\mathcal{H}^{l*}|. \tag{4}$$

Now fix $n > 0$ and let $p > 0$ be the smallest multiple of $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ which is greater than n, i.e., $p = \min\{k \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) :\ k > 0,\ k \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) > n\}$. By (4) we have

$$|\mathcal{H}| = |\mathcal{H}^{p*}| \leq |\mathcal{H}^{(p-1)*}| \leq \ldots \leq |\mathcal{H}^{n*}| \leq \ldots \leq |\mathcal{H}|.$$

Therefore, $|\mathcal{H}^{n*}| = |\mathcal{H}|$ for every $n > 0$. ■

Lemma 2. *$||\mathcal{H}^*||_\wedge \geq ||\mathcal{H}||_\wedge$ and $||\mathcal{H}^*||_\vee \geq ||\mathcal{H}||_\vee$.*

Proof: Let $A \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $A = ||\mathcal{H}||_\vee$, then $A*A \in \mathcal{H}^*$. Thus, $||\mathcal{H}^*||_\vee \geq |A*A| \geq |A| = ||\mathcal{H}||_\vee$.
Now let B and C be any two elements of $\mathcal{H}$. We have $|B * C| \geq |B| \geq ||\mathcal{H}||_\wedge$. This implies that $||\mathcal{H}^*||_\wedge \geq ||\mathcal{H}||_\wedge$. ■

Proposition 4. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$. For every $n > 0$, $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ is a stable partition satisfying $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}^{n*}) = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ and $||\mathcal{H}^{n*}|| = ||\mathcal{H}||$.*

Proof: Proposition 2 shows that $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ is a periodic partition of period $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}^{n*}) = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$. It remains to show that $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ is balanced and that $||\mathcal{H}^{n*}|| = ||\mathcal{H}||$. Let $p > 0$ be the smallest multiple of $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ which is greater than n, i.e., $p = \min\{k \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) : \ k > 0, \ k \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) > n\}$. We have $\mathcal{H}^{p*} = \mathcal{H}$ since $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ divides p. By Lemma 2 we have:

- $||\mathcal{H}|| = ||\mathcal{H}||_\wedge \leq ||\mathcal{H}^*||_\wedge \leq \ldots \leq ||\mathcal{H}^{n*}||_\wedge \leq \ldots \leq ||\mathcal{H}^{p*}||_\wedge = ||\mathcal{H}||_\wedge = ||\mathcal{H}||$.
- $||\mathcal{H}|| = ||\mathcal{H}||_\vee \leq ||\mathcal{H}^*||_\vee \leq \ldots \leq ||\mathcal{H}^{n*}||_\vee \leq \ldots \leq ||\mathcal{H}^{p*}||_\vee = ||\mathcal{H}||_\vee = ||\mathcal{H}||$.

Therefore, $||\mathcal{H}^{n*}||_\wedge = ||\mathcal{H}^{n*}||_\vee = ||\mathcal{H}||$, which means that for every $A \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}$ we have $|A| = ||\mathcal{H}||$. We conclude that $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ is balanced and $||\mathcal{H}^{n*}|| = ||\mathcal{H}||$. ■

Lemma 3. *If $*$ is ergodic then every periodic partition is stable.*

Proof: Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a periodic partition of $\mathcal{X}$. We only need to show that $\mathcal{H}$ is balanced.
Let $n = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ and $m = \min\{kn : k > 0 \text{ and } kn > \mathrm{con}(*)\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{H}^{m*} = \mathcal{H}$. Moreover, Proposition 1 shows that all the elements of $\mathcal{X}$ are $*$-connectable to each other in m steps. Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ be chosen such that $|H|$ is maximal and let H' be any element of $\mathcal{H}$. Let $h \in H$ and $h' \in H'$. We have $h \xrightarrow{*,m} h'$ so there exist m elements $x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1} \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $(\ldots((h * x_0) * x_1) \ldots * x_{m-1}) = h'$.
Since $\mathcal{H}$ covers $\mathcal{X}$, then each of $\mathcal{H}^*$, $\mathcal{H}^{2*}$, …, and $\mathcal{H}^{(m-1)*}$ covers $\mathcal{X}$ as well. And so there exist $X_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, $X_1 \in \mathcal{H}^*$, …, and $X_{m-1} \in \mathcal{H}^{(m-1)*}$ such that $x_0 \in X_0$, $x_1 \in X_1$, …, and $x_{m-1} \in X_{m-1}$. Now since $(\ldots((h*x_0)*x_1)\ldots*x_{m-1}) = h'$ and since $h \in H$, we have $h' \in H'' := (\ldots((H*X_0)*X_1)\ldots*X_{m-1})$. From the definition of H'', we have $H'' \in \mathcal{H}^{m*} = \mathcal{H}$. Moreover, $h' \in H' \cap H''$, so $H' = H''$ since $\mathcal{H}$ is a partition. We conclude that $H' = (\ldots((H * X_0) * X_1)\ldots * X_{m-1})$ which implies that $|H'| \geq |H|$. On the other hand, we have $|H| \geq |H'|$ since H was chosen so that $|H|$ is maximal. We conclude that $|H'| = |H|$ for all $H' \in \mathcal{H}$, hence $\mathcal{H}$ is balanced. ■

Remark 3. *The ergodicity condition in the previous Lemma cannot be replaced by irreducibility. Consider the following irreducible (but not ergodic) operation:*

$*$	0	1	2	3
0	2	3	2	2
1	3	2	3	3
2	0	0	0	1
3	1	1	1	0

Although the partition $\mathcal{H} = \{\{0,1\},\{2\},\{3\}\}$ is not balanced, we have $\mathcal{H}^{2*} = \mathcal{H}$.

The following proposition shows that the concept of periodic partitions generalizes the concept of quotient groups:

Proposition 5. *Let $(G, *)$ be a finite group, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a periodic partition of $(G, *)$. There exists a normal subgroup H of G such that $\mathcal{H}$ is the quotient group of G by H (denoted by G/H).*

Proof: Since every group operation is ergodic, Lemma 3 implies that $\mathcal{H}$ is stable, i.e., it is also balanced.
Let H be the element of $\mathcal{H}$ containing the neutral element e of G. For every $H' \in \mathcal{H}$, we have $|H'| = |H * H'| = |H' * H| = ||\mathcal{H}||$ since $H * H' \in \mathcal{H}^*$, $H' * H \in \mathcal{H}^*$ and $||\mathcal{H}^*|| = ||\mathcal{H}||$. On the other

hand, we have $H' = e*H' \subset H*H'$ and $H' = H'*e \subset H'*H$. We conclude that $H*H' = H'*H = H'$. Therefore,

- $H*H = H$, hence $x*y \in H$ for every $x, y \in H$.
- For every $x \in H$, we have $|H*x| = |H|$. On the other hand, $H*x \subset H*H = H$. Therefore, $H*x = H$ which implies that $e \in H*x$ and so there exists $x' \in H$ such that $x'*x = e$. We conclude that the inverse of any element of H is also in H.
- For every $x \in G$ let $H_x \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $x \in H_x$. We have $x*H \subset H_x*H = H_x$ and $|x*H| \overset{(a)}{=} |H| = |H_x|$, where (a) follows from the fact that $*$ is a group operation. Therefore, $x*H = H_x$. Similarly, we can show that $H*x = H_x$. Hence $x*H = H*x = H_x$ for every $x \in G$.

We conclude that H is a normal subgroup of G, and $\mathcal{H}$ is the quotient group of G by H. ■

Definition 9. *A periodic partition $\mathcal{H}_1$ is said to be a sub-periodic partition of another periodic partition $\mathcal{H}_2$ if for any $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1$, there exists $H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$ such that $H_1 \subset H_2$. We denote this relation by $\mathcal{H}_1 \preceq \mathcal{H}_2$, and we say that $\mathcal{H}_1$ is finer than $\mathcal{H}_2$.*

If $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are two stable partitions satisfying $\mathcal{H}_1 \preceq \mathcal{H}_2$, we say that $\mathcal{H}_1$ is a sub-stable partition of $\mathcal{H}_2$ (in such case, we clearly have $||\mathcal{H}_1||$ divides $||\mathcal{H}_2||$).

Remark 4. *Let $(G, *)$ be a group and let $\mathcal{H}_1$ be a sub-periodic partition of a periodic partition $\mathcal{H}_2$. If $H_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ and $H_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ are the normal subgroups associated with $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ respectively, then $H_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ is a normal subgroup of $H_{\mathcal{H}_2}$.*

Definition 10. *For any two partitions $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ of a set $\mathcal{X}$, we define:*

$$\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2 = \{H_1 \cap H_2 :\ H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1,\ H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2,\ H_1 \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Proposition 6. *If $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are periodic partitions then $\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2$ is a periodic partition of period at most $\operatorname{lcm}\{\operatorname{per}(\mathcal{H}_1), \operatorname{per}(\mathcal{H}_2)\}$. Moreover, we have $(\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2)^{n*} = \mathcal{H}_1^{n*} \wedge \mathcal{H}_2^{n*}$ for every $n \geq 0$.*

Proof: Since $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are two partitions of $\mathcal{X}$, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2$ is also a partition of $\mathcal{X}$. Now let $H_1, H_1' \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $H_2, H_2' \in \mathcal{H}_2$. If $H_1 \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $H_1' \cap H_2' \neq \emptyset$, we have:

$$(H_1 \cap H_2) * (H_1' \cap H_2') \ \subset\ (H_1 * H_1') \cap (H_2 * H_2') \in \mathcal{H}_1^* \wedge \mathcal{H}_2^*. \tag{5}$$

Fix $H_1' \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $H_2' \in \mathcal{H}_2$ such that $H_1' \cap H_2' \neq \emptyset$. Lemma 1 implies that $\mathcal{H}_1^* = \{H_1 * H_1' :\ H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^* = \{H_2 * H_2' :\ H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2\}$. Since $\mathcal{H}_1^*$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^*$ are partitions of $\mathcal{X}$, we have:

$$|\mathcal{X}| = \sum_{A_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1^*, A_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2^*} |A_1 \cap A_2| = \sum_{H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2} |(H_1 * H_1') \cap (H_2 * H_2')|,$$

which implies that

$$|\mathcal{X}| \geq \sum_{\substack{H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2: \\ H_1 \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset}} |(H_1 * H_1') \cap (H_2 * H_2')| \tag{6}$$

$$\geq \sum_{\substack{H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2: \\ H_1 \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset}} |(H_1 \cap H_2) * (H_1' \cap H_2')|, \tag{7}$$

where (7) follows from (5). Now since $H_1' \cap H_2' \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$|(H_1 \cap H_2) * (H_1' \cap H_2')| \geq |H_1 \cap H_2|. \tag{8}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{\substack{H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2: \\ H_1 \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset}} |(H_1 \cap H_2) * (H_1' \cap H_2')| \geq \sum_{\substack{H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2: \\ H_1 \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset}} |H_1 \cap H_2|. \tag{9}$$

Now since $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are two partitions of $\mathcal{X}$, we have $\sum_{\substack{H_1\in\mathcal{H}_1, H_2\in\mathcal{H}_2:\\ H_1\cap H_2\neq\emptyset}} |H_1\cap H_2| = |\mathcal{X}|$. We conclude that all the inequalities in (6), (7), (8) and (9) are in fact equalities. Therefore, for all $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$ satisfying $H_1 \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset$, we have $|(H_1 \cap H_2) * (H_1' \cap H_2')| = |(H_1 * H_1') \cap (H_2 * H_2')|$. Equation (5) now implies that $(H_1 \cap H_2) * (H_1' \cap H_2') = (H_1 * H_1') \cap (H_2 * H_2')$. We conclude that for every $H_1, H_1' \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $H_2, H_2' \in \mathcal{H}_2$ satisfying $H_1 \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $H_1' \cap H_2' \neq \emptyset$, we have $(H_1 \cap H_2) * (H_1' \cap H_2') = (H_1 * H_1') \cap (H_2 * H_2') \in \mathcal{H}_1^* \wedge \mathcal{H}_2^*$. Hence $(\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2)^* \subset \mathcal{H}_1^* \wedge \mathcal{H}_2^*$. We have the following:

- $(\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2)^*$ covers $\mathcal{X}$ since $\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2$ covers $\mathcal{X}$.
- $\mathcal{H}_1^* \wedge \mathcal{H}_2^*$ is a partition of $\mathcal{X}$.
- $(\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2)^* \subset \mathcal{H}_1^* \wedge \mathcal{H}_2^*$.

Therefore, we must have $(\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2)^* = \mathcal{H}_1^* \wedge \mathcal{H}_2^*$.

It follows by induction that $(\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2)^{n*} = \mathcal{H}_1^{n*} \wedge \mathcal{H}_2^{n*}$ for all $n \geq 0$. In particular, for $l = \mathrm{lcm}(\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}_1), \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}_2))$, we have $(\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2)^{l*} = \mathcal{H}_1^{l*} \wedge \mathcal{H}_2^{l*} = \mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2$, which implies that $\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2$ is a periodic partition of period at most $\mathrm{lcm}(\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}_1), \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}_2))$. ■

Corollary 1. *Let $*$ be an ergodic operation. If $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are two stable partitions then $\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2$ is a stable partition of period at most* $\mathrm{lcm}\{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}_1), \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}_2)\}$.

Proof: The corollary follows from Proposition 6 and Lemma 3. ■

Remark 5. *Let $(G, *)$ be a group. If $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are two periodic partitions of $(G, *)$, then $H_{\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2} = H_{\mathcal{H}_1} \cap H_{\mathcal{H}_2}$.*

Remark 6. *The ergodicity condition in Corollary 1 cannot be replaced by irreducibility. Consider the following irreducible (but not ergodic) operation:*

$*$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0	4	5	6	7	4	4	4	4
1	5	4	7	6	5	5	5	5
2	6	7	4	5	6	6	6	6
3	7	6	5	4	7	7	7	7
4	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
5	1	1	1	1	1	0	3	2
6	2	2	2	2	2	3	0	1
7	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	0

Define:

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = \big\{\{0,1\},\{2,3\},\{4,5\},\{6,7\}\big\},$$
$$\mathcal{H}_2 = \big\{\{0,2\},\{1,3\},\{4,5\},\{6,7\}\big\}.$$

While both $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are stable partitions of periods 1 and 2 respectively, the partition $\mathcal{H}_1 \wedge \mathcal{H}_2 = \big\{\{0\},\{1\},\{2\},\{3\},\{4,5\},\{6,7\}\big\}$ is periodic but it is not stable as it is not balanced.

V. The residue of a stable partition

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition. Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $x \in H$. For any sequence $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ satisfying $X_n \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}$ for all $n \geq 0$, define the sequences $(A_n)_{n\geq 0}$ and $(H_n)_{n\geq 0}$ recursively as follows:

- $A_0 = \{x\}$ and $H_0 = H$.
- $A_n = A_{n-1} * X_{n-1} = (\ldots((x * X_0) * X_1) \ldots * X_{n-1})$.
- $H_n = H_{n-1} * X_{n-1} = (\ldots((H * X_0) * X_1) \ldots * X_{n-1})$.

Since $x \in H$, we have $A_n \subset H_n \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}$ and so $|A_n| \leq |H_n| = ||\mathcal{H}^{n*}|| = ||\mathcal{H}||$ for all $n \geq 0$. Therefore, $|H_n|$ is constant. On the other hand, $|A_n| \geq |A_{n-1}|$ since $A_n = A_{n-1} * X_{n-1}$. Hence, $|A_n|$ is increasing and it is upper bounded by $||\mathcal{H}||$.

Does $|A_n|$ reach $||\mathcal{H}||$ or does $|A_n|$ remain strictly less than $||\mathcal{H}||$ for all $n \geq 0$? In other words, do we have $A_n = H_n$ for some $n > 0$ or does A_n remain a strict subset of H_n for all $n \geq 0$? The answer depends of course on the sequence $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$, so one can ask: Is it possible to choose at least one sequence $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ for which $|A_n| = ||\mathcal{H}||$ and $A_n = H_n$ for some $n > 0$?

What are the stable partitions $\mathcal{H}$ for which it is always possible to reach a set in $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$ for some $n > 0$ starting from an arbitrary singleton in $\mathcal{X}$ and then recursively multiplying on the right by sets chosen from $\mathcal{H}^{i*}$ $(0 \leq i < n)$?

It is easy to see that for the trivial stable partition $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathcal{X}\}$, the above condition is equivalent to ergodicity. Therefore, satisfying the above condition for every stable partition is a stronger notion of ergodicity. Strong ergodicity turns out to be important for polarization theory as we will see in Part II of this paper [1]. In this section, we introduce the notions and concepts that are necessary to understand strong ergodicity.

Notation 4. *Let $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0\leq i<k}$ be a sequence of subsets X_i of $\mathcal{X}$. We denote the length k of the sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ by $|\mathfrak{X}|$.*

For any $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, we denote $(\dots((A * X_0) * X_1)\dots) * X_{k-1})$ by $A * \mathfrak{X}$. If $A = \{a\}$, we write $a * \mathfrak{X}$ to denote $\{a\} * \mathfrak{X}$.

The n^{th} power of the sequence $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0\leq i<k}$ is the sequence $\mathfrak{X}^n = (X'_i)_{0\leq i<kn}$, where $X'_i = X_{i \bmod k}$ for $0 \leq i < kn$. I.e., $\mathfrak{X}^n$ is obtained by concatenating n copies of $\mathfrak{X}$.

Definition 11. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ where $*$ is uniformity preserving. A sequence $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0\leq i<k}$ is said to be* $\mathcal{H}$-sequence *if $X_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, $X_1 \in \mathcal{H}^*$, …, $X_{k-1} \in \mathcal{H}^{(k-1)*}$. If we also have that $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ divides $|\mathfrak{X}| = k$, we say that the sequence is* $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable.

An $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ is said to be $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting *if $A \subset A * \mathfrak{X}$ for all $A \subset \mathcal{X}$.*

Let $A \subset \mathcal{X}$. We say that an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ connects *A if for every $a \in A$ we have $A \subset a * \mathfrak{X}$.*

Remark 7. *If $\mathfrak{X}$ is $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable, then $\mathfrak{X}^l$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence for every $l > 0$. This is not necessarily true if $\mathfrak{X}$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence which is not repeatable.*

Note also that if a sequence is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting then it is also $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable by definition. Therefore, whenever we need to show that a sequence is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting, we have to show first that it is $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ where $*$ is ergodic, there exists a unique sub-stable partition $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ such that:*

- *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}$ and every $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}$, $K * \mathfrak{X} \in {\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}}^{|\mathcal{X}|*}$.*
- *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}$ and every $x \in K$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ such that $x * \mathfrak{X} = K$.*
- *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}$, every $x \in K$, and every $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}'$, $x * \mathfrak{X}' \subset K$.*

$\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}$ is called the first residue *of the stable partition $\mathcal{H}$. We also have ${\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}}^{l*} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$ for all $l \geq 0$.*

Remark 8. *Theorem 1 implies that an ergodic operation is strongly ergodic if and only if $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}$ for every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{X}$. This will be explained and proven in detail in section VI.*

In order to prove Theorem 1, we need several lemmas:

Lemma 4. *For any stable partition $\mathcal{H}$, and for any $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence $\mathfrak{X}$, there exists an integer $l > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{X}^l$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting.*

Proof: Let $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0\leq i<k}$ and let $x_i \in X_i$ for $0 \leq i < k$. Consider the mapping $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ defined by $\pi(x) = (\dots((x * x_0) * x_1)\dots) * x_{k-1})$. Since π is a permutation, there exists an integer $l > 0$ such that $\pi^l(x) = x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. For any $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, we have $A = \pi^l(A) \subset A * \mathfrak{X}^l$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{X}^l$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. ∎

Lemma 5. *If there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects a set $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, then there exists $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $A \subset H$.*

Proof: Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be such an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence. Let $a \in A$ and $H' \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $a \in H'$. Define $H = H' * \mathfrak{X} \in \mathcal{H}^{|\mathfrak{X}|*}$. Since $\mathfrak{X}$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting, $|\mathfrak{X}|$ divides $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ and so $\mathcal{H}^{|\mathfrak{X}|*} = \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, $H \in \mathcal{H}$. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{X}$ connects A, so we have $A \subset a * \mathfrak{X} \subset H' * \mathfrak{X} = H$. ■

Lemma 6. *Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and let $\mathfrak{X}$ be an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence. For any $y \in x * \mathfrak{X}$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}'$ which connects $\{x, y\}$.*

Proof: Let $y \in x * \mathfrak{X} = (\ldots((x * X_0) * X_1)\ldots) * X_{k-1})$. There exist $x_i \in X_i$ $(0 \leq i < k)$ such that $y = (\ldots((x*x_0)*x_1)\ldots)*x_{k-1})$. Define the mapping $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ as $\pi(a) = (\ldots((a*x_0)*x_2)\ldots)*x_{k-1})$ for every $a \in \mathcal{X}$. Clearly, π is a permutation. The fact that $y = \pi(x)$ implies that x and y belong to the same cycle of the permutation π. Therefore, there exists $s > 0$ such that $x = \pi^s(y)$. Let $\mathfrak{X}' = \mathfrak{X}^s$. It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{X}'$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. Moreover, we have:

- $x \in y*\mathfrak{X}'$ because $x = \pi^s(y)$, and $y \in y*\mathfrak{X}'$ because $\mathfrak{X}'$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. Therefore, $\{x, y\} \subset y*\mathfrak{X}'$.
- $y \in x * \mathfrak{X}$ by assumption and $x \in x * \mathfrak{X}$ since $\mathfrak{X}$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. Therefore, $\{x, y\} \subset x * \mathfrak{X}$. On the other hand, $x*\mathfrak{X} \subset (x*\mathfrak{X})*\mathfrak{X}^{s-1}$ since $\mathfrak{X}^{s-1}$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. Hence $\{x, y\} \subset (x*\mathfrak{X})*\mathfrak{X}^{s-1} = x*\mathfrak{X}'$.

We conclude that $\mathfrak{X}'$ connects $\{x, y\}$. ■

Lemma 7. *If there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects a set $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, and if there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects another set $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$, then there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects $A \cup B$.*

Proof: Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects A, and let $\mathfrak{X}'$ be an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects B. Let $\mathfrak{X}'' = (\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}', \mathfrak{X})$ be the $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence that is obtained by concatenating $\mathfrak{X}$, $\mathfrak{X}'$ and $\mathfrak{X}$. Clearly, $\mathfrak{X}''$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. Fix $x \in A \cap B$ and let $y \in A \cup B$. We have the following:

- If $y \in A$, then $A \subset y * \mathfrak{X}$. In particular, $x \in y * \mathfrak{X}$. Now since $x \in B$ and since $\mathfrak{X}'$ connects B, we have $B \subset x * \mathfrak{X}'$. Therefore, $B \subset (y * \mathfrak{X}) * \mathfrak{X}'$.
- If $y \in B$, then $y \in y * \mathfrak{X}$ since $\mathfrak{X}$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. Now since $y \in B$ and since $\mathfrak{X}'$ connects B, we have $B \subset y * \mathfrak{X}'$. Therefore, $B \subset (y * \mathfrak{X}) * \mathfrak{X}'$.

We conclude that for any $y \in A \cup B$, we have $B \subset (y * \mathfrak{X}) * \mathfrak{X}'$. This implies that:

- $B \subset ((y * \mathfrak{X}) * \mathfrak{X}') * \mathfrak{X} = y * \mathfrak{X}''$ since $\mathfrak{X}$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting.
- Since $B \subset (y * \mathfrak{X}) * \mathfrak{X}'$, we have $x \in (y * \mathfrak{X}) * \mathfrak{X}'$. Now since $x \in A$ and since $\mathfrak{X}$ connects A, we have $A \subset x * \mathfrak{X}$. Therefore, $A \subset ((y * \mathfrak{X}) * \mathfrak{X}') * \mathfrak{X} = y * \mathfrak{X}''$.

We conclude that $A \cup B \subset y * \mathfrak{X}''$ for any $y \in A \cup B$. Hence $\mathfrak{X}''$ connects $A \cup B$. ■

Definition 12. *For every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$, define the* connectivity relation *$R_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ as follows: $aR_{\mathcal{H}}b$ if and only if there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects $\{a, b\}$.*

Lemma 8. *For every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$, $R_{\mathcal{H}}$ is an equivalence relation.*

Proof: Clearly, $R_{\mathcal{H}}$ is symmetric. Lemma 7 shows that $R_{\mathcal{H}}$ is transitive. In order to show that $R_{\mathcal{H}}$ is reflexive, let $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathfrak{X}$ be an arbitrary $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence. Lemma 4 implies that there exists $l > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{X}^l$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. We have $x \in x * \mathfrak{X}^l$ and so $\mathfrak{X}^l$ connects $\{x\}$. Therefore, $xR_{\mathcal{H}}x$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, hence $R_{\mathcal{H}}$ is reflexive. We conclude that $R_{\mathcal{H}}$ is an equivalence relation. ■

Notation 5. *For every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$, we denote the set of equivalence classes of its connectivity relation $R_{\mathcal{H}}$ by $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$.*

Lemma 9. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition and let $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$. We have:*

- *For every $x \in K$ and every $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}'$, $x * \mathfrak{X}' \subset K$.*
- *There exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ satisfying $x * \mathfrak{X} = K$ for all $x \in K$.*

Proof: For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$, every $x \in K$, every $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}'$, and every $y \in x * \mathfrak{X}'$, we have $xR_{\mathcal{H}}y$ because of Lemma 6, so $y \in K$. This shows that $x * \mathfrak{X}' \subset K$.

Now fix $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and let $K = \{a_1, \ldots, a_r\}$ where $r = |K|$. For each $1 \leq i \leq r$, define $K_i := \{a_1, \ldots, a_i\}$. Since $a_1 R_{\mathcal{H}} a_1$ there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects K_1. Now let $1 < i \leq r$ and suppose that there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects K_{i-1}. Since $a_{i-1} R_{\mathcal{H}} a_i$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects $\{a_{i-1}, a_i\}$. Now since $K_{i-1} \cap \{a_{i-1}, a_i\} = \{a_{i-1}\} \neq \emptyset$, Lemma 7 implies that there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence that connects $K_{i-1} \cup \{a_{i-1}, a_i\} = K_i$, and so the claim is true for i. By induction we conclude that the claim is true for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. In particular, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ that connects $K_r = K$.

Let $x \in K$. Since $\mathfrak{X}$ connects K, we have $K \subset x * \mathfrak{X}$, which implies that $x * \mathfrak{X} = K$ as we already have $x * \mathfrak{X} \subset K$. ■

Lemma 10. *If $*$ is an ergodic operation on $\mathcal{X}$, then for every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$, we have the following:*

- *$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$ is a balanced partition and $||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}|| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}||$ for all $l \geq 0$.*
- *For every $l \geq 0$, $K_1 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$, and every $a \in K_1$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2}$ such that $|\mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2}| \equiv l \bmod n$ and $K_2 = a * \mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2} = K_1 * \mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2}$.*

Proof: Let $K_1 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $l \geq 0$ and $K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$. Let $n = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$, $k_1 = \mathrm{con}(*)n + l$ and $k_2 = \mathrm{con}(*)n + (-l \bmod n)$. Choose $a \in K_1$ and $b \in K_2$. Since $*$ is ergodic and since $k_1 \geq \mathrm{con}(*)$ and $k_2 \geq \mathrm{con}(*)$, it follows from Proposition 1 that there exist $x_0, \ldots, x_{k_1-1} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $b = (\ldots((a * x_0) * x_1)\ldots) * x_{k_1-1})$ and there exist $y_0, \ldots, y_{k_2-1} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $a = (\ldots((b * y_0) * y_1)\ldots) * y_{k_2-1})$. Let $\mathfrak{X}_1 = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < k_1}$ and $\mathfrak{X}_2 = (Y_i)_{0 \leq i < k_2}$ be such that $x_i \in X_i \in \mathcal{H}^{i*}$ for $0 \leq i < k_1$ and $y_i \in Y_i \in \mathcal{H}^{(l+i)*}$ for $0 \leq i < k_2$. Clearly, $b \in a * \mathcal{X}_1$ and $a \in b * \mathcal{X}_2$. The concatenation $\mathfrak{X} = (\mathfrak{X}_1, \mathfrak{X}_2)$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence since n divides $k_1 + k_2$. Lemma 4 implies that there exists an integer $s > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{X}^s$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. Lemma 9, applied to $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$, implies the existence of an $\mathcal{H}^{l*}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}'$ such that $b * \mathfrak{X}' = K_2$.

Consider the sequence $\mathfrak{X}'' = (\mathfrak{X}_1, \mathfrak{X}', \mathfrak{X}_2, \mathfrak{X}^{s-1})$. It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{X}''$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting and so $K_1 \subset K_1 * \mathfrak{X}''$. On the other hand, since $\mathfrak{X}''$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting, Lemma 9 shows that for every $x \in K_1$ we have $x * \mathfrak{X}'' \subset K_1$, which means that $K_1 * \mathfrak{X}'' \subset K_1$. Therefore, $K_1 = K_1 * \mathfrak{X}''$. Moreover, since $b \in a * \mathfrak{X}_1$ and $b * \mathfrak{X}' = K_2$, we have

$$K_2 \subset (a * \mathfrak{X}_1) * \mathfrak{X}' \subset (K_1 * \mathfrak{X}_1) * \mathfrak{X}' \tag{10}$$

which implies that $|K_2| \leq |(K_1 * \mathfrak{X}_1) * \mathfrak{X}'| \leq |(((K_1 * \mathfrak{X}_1) * \mathfrak{X}') * \mathfrak{X}_2) * \mathfrak{X}^{s-1}| = |K_1 * \mathfrak{X}''| = |K_1|$. By exchanging the roles of K_1 and K_2, we get $|K_1| \leq |K_2|$. Therefore, $|K_2| = |K_1|$ for every $K_1 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and every $K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$. We conclude that both $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$ are balanced partitions and $||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}|| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}||$.

Now define $\mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2} = (\mathfrak{X}_1, \mathfrak{X}')$. Since $\mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2}$ is an initial segment of $\mathfrak{X}''$, we have $|K_1 * \mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2}| \leq |K_1 * \mathfrak{X}''|$. But we have shown that $K_1 * \mathfrak{X}'' = K_1$ and $|K_1| = |K_2|$, so we must have $|K_1 * \mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2}| \leq |K_2|$. Moreover, we have $K_2 \subset a * \mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2} \subset K_1 * \mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2}$ from (10). We conclude that $K_2 = a * \mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2} = K_1 * \mathfrak{X}_{a,K_2}$. ■

Lemma 11. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ where $*$ is ergodic. For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and every $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}$, we have $|K * \mathfrak{X}| = |K| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}||$.*

Proof: Let $K' = K * \mathfrak{X}$ and $l = |\mathfrak{X}|$, and let $\mathfrak{X}' = (X'_i)_{0 \leq i < (-l \bmod n)}$ be an arbitrary $\mathcal{H}^{l*}$-sequence of length $(-l \bmod n)$. Clearly, $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}')$ is $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable. Lemma 4 implies that there exists an integer $s > 0$ such that $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}')^s$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. We have $K \subset K * (\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}')^s$. On the other hand, Lemma 9 implies that $K * (\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}')^s \subset K$. Therefore, $K = K * (\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}')^s = K' * (\mathfrak{X}', (\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}')^{s-1})$ which implies that $|K'| \leq |K|$. We also have $|K| \leq |K'|$ since $K' = K * \mathfrak{X}$. Thus, $|K'| = |K| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}||$. ■

Lemma 12. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ where $*$ is ergodic. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $l > 0$. If $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < l}$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence, then $K * \mathfrak{X} \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$.*

Proof: Let $K' = K * \mathfrak{X}$. Fix $x \in K'$ and let $K'' \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$ be chosen so that $x \in K''$. Lemma 9 implies the existence of an $\mathcal{H}^{l*}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}''$ such that $x * \mathfrak{X}'' = K''$. We have $K'' \subset K' * \mathfrak{X}''$ since $x \in K'$, and $K' \subset K' * \mathfrak{X}''$ since $\mathfrak{X}''$ is $\mathcal{H}^{l*}$-augmenting. Therefore, $K' \cup K'' \subset K' * \mathfrak{X}''$. On the other hand, we have the following:

- $|K'| = |K * \mathfrak{X}| = |K| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}||$ from Lemma 11.

- $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}'')$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence, so Lemma 11 implies that $|K * (\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}'')| = |K| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}||$. Now since $K' * \mathfrak{X}'' = K * (\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{X}'')$, we deduce that $|K' * \mathfrak{X}''| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}||$.
- Lemma 10 implies that $||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}|| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}||$, so $|K''| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}|| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}||$.

Therefore, $|K''| = |K'| = |K' * \mathfrak{X}''| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}||$ and $K' \cup K'' \subset K' * \mathfrak{X}''$, hence $K' = K''$ and $K' \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$. ■

Lemma 13. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ where $*$ is ergodic. $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a sub-stable partition of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}} = {\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{l*}$ for all $l \geq 0$.*

Proof: We will prove that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}} = {\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{l*}$ by induction on $l \geq 0$. The statement is trivial for $l = 0$. Now let $l > 0$ and suppose that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{(l-1)*}} = {\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{(l-1)*}$. Let $K \in {\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{l*} = ({\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{(l-1)*})^* = (\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{(l-1)*}})^*$. There exist $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{(l-1)*}} = {\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{(l-1)*}$ such that $K = K_1 * K_2$. Let $H_2 \in \mathcal{H}^{(l-1)*}$ be chosen such that $K_2 \subset H_2$ (Lemma 5 guarantees the existence of H_2). From Lemma 12, we have $K_1 * H_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$ and so $|K_1 * H_2| = ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}|| \overset{(a)}{=} ||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{(l-1)*}}|| = |K_1|$, where (a) follows from Lemma 10. We have $K_1 * K_2 \subset K_1 * H_2$ and $|K_1| \leq |K_1 * K_2| \leq |K_1 * H_2| = |K_1|$. Therefore, $K = K_1 * K_2 = K_1 * H_2$ which implies that $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$. This shows that ${\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{l*} \subset \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$, which implies that ${\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{l*} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$ since ${\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{l*}$ covers $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{X}$.

We conclude that ${\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{l*} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$ for all $l \geq 0$. In particular, ${\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{n*} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{n*}} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$, where $n = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ so $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is periodic. Moreover, Lemma 10 shows that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is balanced. Therefore, $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a stable partition. Lemma 5 now implies that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a sub-stable partition of $\mathcal{H}$. ■

Proposition 7. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ where $*$ is ergodic, and let $\mathcal{K}$ be a partition of $\mathcal{X}$ which satisfies the following two conditions:*

- *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and every $x \in K$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ such that $x * \mathfrak{X} = K$.*
- *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}$, every $x \in K$, and every $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}'$, $x * \mathfrak{X}' \subset K$.*

Then $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof: Fix $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and let $K_{1,x} \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $K_{2,x} \in \mathcal{K}$ be chosen such that $x \in K_{1,x}$ and $x \in K_{2,x}$. Lemma 9 implies the existence of an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}_1$ such that $x * \mathfrak{X}_1 = K_{1,x}$, and the first condition of the proposition implies the existence of an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}_2$ such that $x * \mathfrak{X}_2 = K_{2,x}$. The second condition of the proposition implies that $x * \mathfrak{X}_1 \subset K_{2,x}$, and Lemma 9 implies that $x * \mathfrak{X}_2 \subset K_{1,x}$. Therefore, $K_{1,x} \subset K_{2,x}$ and $K_{2,x} \subset K_{1,x}$ which implies that $K_{1,x} = K_{2,x}$. Since this is true for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we conclude that $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$. ■

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1:

Proof of Theorem 1: The existence follows from Lemma 5 and Lemmas 9-13, and the uniqueness follows from Proposition 7. ■

Remark 9. *It is possible to prove a more general theorem for the periodic partitions of an arbitrary uniformity preserving operation:*

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a periodic partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ where $*$ is an arbitrary uniformity preserving operation, there exists a unique sub-periodic partition $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ such that:

- *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and every $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}$, $K * \mathfrak{X} \in {\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{|\mathcal{X}|*}$.*
- *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and every $x \in K$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ such that $x * \mathfrak{X} = K$.*
- *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$, every $x \in K$, and every $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}'$, $x * \mathfrak{X}' \subset K$.*

$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is called the first residue *of the periodic partition $\mathcal{H}$. We also have ${\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{l*} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{l*}}$ for all $l \geq 0$.*

We will not prove this general theorem here since Theorem 1 is sufficient for our purposes. The proof of the general theorem is more complicated but follows similar steps as the proof of Theorem 1.

Note that if the operation $*$ is not ergodic, $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ may not be a stable partition even if $\mathcal{H}$ is a stable partition. Consider the following irreducible (but not ergodic) operation:

$*$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4
1	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5
2	6	7	6	7	6	6	6	6
3	7	6	7	6	7	7	7	7
4	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3
5	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2
6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
7	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0

Let $\mathcal{H} = \big\{\{0,2\},\{1,3\},\{4,5\},\{6,7\}\big\}$, which is a stable partition of period 2. The reader can check that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}} = \big\{\{0\},\{1\},\{2\},\{3\},\{4,5\},\{6,7\}\big\}$ which is periodic but not stable as it is not balanced.

Definition 13. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X},*)$ where $*$ is ergodic. For every $n \geq 0$, we define the n^{th} residue $\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{H})$ of $\mathcal{H}$ recursively as follows:*

- $\mathcal{R}_0(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{H}$.
- $\mathcal{R}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
- $\mathcal{R}_{n+1}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{R}_1(\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{H})) = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{H})}$ *for every* $n \geq 1$.

The residual degree $\deg_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{H})$ *of $\mathcal{H}$ is the smallest integer $n \geq 0$ satisfying $\mathcal{R}_{n+1}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{H})$. The residue of $\mathcal{H}$ is defined as $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}) := \mathcal{R}_{\deg_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{H})$. Clearly $\mathcal{R}_1(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H})) = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H})} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H})) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H})$.*

Remark 10. *For every $n \geq 0$, there exists an ergodic operation and a stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ of residual degree n.*

VI. Strongly ergodic operations

Definition 14. *A uniformity preserving operation $*$ is said to be* strongly ergodic *if for any stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ and for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists an integer $n = n(x,\mathcal{H})$ such that for any $H \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}_{x,H}$ of length n such that $x * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H} = H$.*

Theorem 2. *We have the following:*

1) *If $*$ is strongly ergodic then it is ergodic.*
2) *If $*$ is strongly ergodic, there exists an integer $d > 0$ such that for any $s \geq d$, any stable partition $\mathcal{H}$, any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $H \in \mathcal{H}^{s*}$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathcal{X}_{x,H}$ of length s satisfying $x * \mathcal{X}_{x,H} = H$. If d is minimal with this property, we call it the* strong connectability *of $*$, and we denote it by* $\mathrm{scon}(*)$.
3) *If $*$ is ergodic, $*$ is strongly ergodic if and only if $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}$ for every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ (i.e., every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ is its own residue, and so the residual degree is zero).*
4) *If $*$ is a quasigroup operation then it is strongly ergodic.*

Proof: 1) Suppose that $*$ is strongly ergodic and consider the trivial stable partition $\{\mathcal{X}\}$. For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists $n_x > 0$ such that $x * (\mathcal{X})^{n_x} = \mathcal{X}$. This shows that for every $y \in \mathcal{X}$, $x \xrightarrow{*,n_x} y$ which shows that $*$ is irreducible. Let $n = \mathrm{per}(*)$ and let $H_0, \ldots, H_{n-1}$ be the equally sized subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ given by the fourth point of Proposition 1.

Let $x \in H_0$. We have $\mathcal{X} = x*(\mathcal{X})^{n_x} \subset H_0*(\mathcal{X})^{n_x} = H_{n_x \bmod n}$, where the last equality follows from the fourth point of Proposition 1. Therefore, $H_{n_x \bmod n} = \mathcal{X}$ which implies that $n = 1$ since $\{H_0, \ldots, H_{n-1}\}$ is a partition. Therefore, $\mathrm{per}(*) = 1$ and so $*$ is ergodic by the seventh point of Proposition 1.

2) Let $*$ be strongly ergodic, and define $d = \max\limits_{x,\mathcal{H}} n(x,\mathcal{H})$, where $n(x,\mathcal{H})$ is as in Definition 14. Now fix $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and fix a stable partition $\mathcal{H}$. Let $s \geq d$ and fix $H \in \mathcal{H}^{s*}$. If $s = n(x,\mathcal{H})$, there is nothing to prove. Now suppose that $s > n := n(x,H)$, then there exists $H' \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}$ and an $\mathcal{H}^{n*}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ of

length $s-n$ such that $H' * \mathfrak{X} = H$. Moreover, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}_{x,H'}$ of length n such that $x * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H'} = H'$. We conclude that $x * (\mathfrak{X}_{x,H'}, \mathfrak{X}) = H$.

3) Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ where $*$ is strongly ergodic, and let $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}$ be chosen so that $x \in K \subset H$. Let $s = \mathrm{scon}(*) \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$. We have $\mathcal{H}^{s*} = \mathcal{H}$ since $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ divides s. Now since $s \geq \mathrm{scon}(*)$ and $H \in \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{s*}$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}_{x,H}$ of length s such that $x * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H} = H$. We have $x \in H = x * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H} \subset K * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H}$, so $x \in K * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H}$ which implies that $K \cap (K * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H}) \neq \emptyset$ (since we also have $x \in K$). On the other hand, Lemma 12 implies that $K * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H} \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Therefore, $K * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H} = K$ since $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a partition. We conclude that $H = x * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H} \subset K * \mathfrak{X}_{x,H} = K$ which implies that $H = K$ since we also have $K \subset H$. Therefore, $||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}|| = ||\mathcal{H}||$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}$.

Now suppose that $*$ is an ergodic operation which satisfies $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}$ for every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition. Let $k = \mathrm{con}(*) \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \mathrm{con}(*)$, and for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ fix $x_H \in H$ and let $\mathfrak{X}_H$ be an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence such that $x_H * \mathfrak{X}_H = H$ (such $\mathfrak{X}_H$ exists due to Lemma 9). Define $n(x, H) = k + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\mathfrak{X}_H|$ and define $\mathfrak{X}'$ to be the $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence obtained by concatenating all the $\mathfrak{X}_H$ sequences (the order of the concatenation is not important). It is easy to see that $x_H * \mathfrak{X}' = H$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$, and $|\mathfrak{X}'| = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\mathfrak{X}_H|$. Now since $k \geq \mathrm{con}(*)$, it follows from Proposition 1 that for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$ there exists a sequence $x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1}$ satisfying $(\ldots((x * x_0) * x_1) \ldots * x_{k-1}) = x_H$. Let $\mathfrak{X}'_H = (X_0, \ldots, X_{k-1})$ be an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence of length k such that $x_i \in X_i$ for all $0 \leq i < k$. Clearly, $x_H \in x * \mathfrak{X}'_H$. It is easy to see that the sequence $\mathfrak{X}''_H = (\mathfrak{X}'_H, \mathfrak{X}')$ is of length $n(x, \mathcal{H})$ and satisfies $H \subset x * \mathfrak{X}''_H$. Now let $H_x \in \mathcal{H}$ be chosen so that $x \in H_x$. Since $H_x \in \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$, Lemma 12 implies that we have $H_x * \mathfrak{X}''_H \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}^{n(x,\mathcal{H})*}} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}$ (note that $\mathcal{H}^{n(x,\mathcal{H})*} = \mathcal{H}$ since $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ divides $n(x, \mathcal{H})$). We conclude that $H \subset x * \mathfrak{X}''_H \subset H_x * \mathfrak{X}''_H \in \mathcal{H}$, which implies that $H = x * \mathfrak{X}''_H = H_x * \mathfrak{X}''_H$ since we have $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ is a partition. Therefore, for every $H \in \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{n(x,\mathcal{H})*}$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}''_H$ of length $n(x, \mathcal{H})$ such that $x * \mathfrak{X}''_H = H$. Thus, $*$ is a strongly ergodic operation.

4) Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of a quasigroup operation $*$. For any $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and any $x \in K$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < k}$ such that $K = x * \mathfrak{X}$, which implies that $|K| = |x * \mathfrak{X}| = \left|\left(x * (X_i)_{0 \leq i < k-1}\right) * X_{k-1}\right| \overset{(a)}{\geq} |X_{k-1}|$, where (a) is true because $*$ is a quasigroup operation. We conclude that $||\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}|| = ||\mathcal{H}||$ which implies that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}$. ■

Remark 11. *While every strongly ergodic operation $*$ is ergodic, the converse is not true. Consider the following operation:*

$*$	0	1	2	3
0	2	2	0	0
1	3	3	1	1
2	1	1	3	3
3	0	0	2	2

The first residue of the stable partition $\mathcal{H} = \{\{0,1\},\{2,3\}\}$ is $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}} = \{\{0\},\{1\},\{2\},\{3\}\} \neq \mathcal{H}$.

Also, a strongly ergodic operation need not be a quasigroup operation, here is an example:

$*$	0	1	2	3
0	3	3	3	3
1	0	1	0	0
2	1	0	1	1
3	2	2	2	2

VII. Generated stable partitions

Definition 15. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be two sets of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is* finer *than $\mathcal{B}$ (or $\mathcal{B}$ is* coarser *than $\mathcal{A}$) if for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $A \subset B$. We write $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{B}$ to denote the relation "$\mathcal{A}$ is finer than $\mathcal{B}$".*

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$. Is it possible to find a periodic partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ which is coarser than $\mathcal{A}$ and finer than every other periodic partition that is coarser than $\mathcal{A}$? Similarly, is it possible to find a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ which is coarser than $\mathcal{A}$ and finer than every other stable partition that is coarser than $\mathcal{A}$? The following answer these two questions.

Proposition 8. *Let $*$ be a uniformity preserving operation on $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$. There exists a unique periodic partition $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ which satisfies the following:*

- *$\mathcal{A} \preceq \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$.*
- *For every periodic partition $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{X}$, if $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{H}$ then $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle \preceq \mathcal{H}$.*

In other words, $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ is the finest periodic partition that is coarser than $\mathcal{A}$. $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ is called the periodic partition generated *by $\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof: Define

$$\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle = \bigwedge_{\substack{\mathcal{H} \text{ is a periodic partition} \\ \mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{H}}} \mathcal{H}. \tag{11}$$

Proposition 6 implies that $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ is a periodic partition. Moreover, it follows from (11) and from the definition of the wedge operator (Definition 10) that for every periodic partition $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{H}$, we have $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle \preceq \mathcal{H}$.

Now let $A \in \mathcal{A}$. We have:

- If $A = \emptyset$, then $A \subset B$ for any $B \in \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$.
- If $A \neq \emptyset$, then for every periodic partition $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{H}$, choose $B_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $A \subset B_{\mathcal{H}}$. Define

$$B = \bigcap_{\substack{\mathcal{H} \text{ is a periodic partition} \\ \mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{H}}} B_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

  Clearly, $A \subset B$ which implies that $B \neq \emptyset$ and so $B \in \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle$ (see Definition 10).

We conclude that for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists $B \in \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ such that $A \subset B$. Therefore, $\mathcal{A} \preceq \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$.

Now let $\mathcal{H}'$ be a periodic partition satisfying the conditions of the proposition. I.e.,

- $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{H}'$.
- For every periodic partition $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{X}$, if $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{H}$ then $\mathcal{H}' \preceq \mathcal{H}$.

Since $\mathcal{A} \preceq \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$, we have $\mathcal{H}' \preceq \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$. Similarly, since $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{H}'$ we have $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle \preceq \mathcal{H}'$. Therefore, $\mathcal{H}' = \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ and so $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ is unique. ■

Remark 12. *It is possible to show that $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle^{n*} = \langle \mathcal{A}^{n*} \rangle$ for every $n > 0$, but we will not prove this here since we do not need this property for our purposes.*

Corollary 2. *Let $*$ be an ergodic operation on $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$. There exists a unique stable partition $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ which satisfies the following:*

- *$\mathcal{A} \preceq \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$.*
- *For every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{X}$, if $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{H}$ then $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle \preceq \mathcal{H}$.*

In other words, $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ is the finest stable partition that is coarser than $\mathcal{A}$. $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ is called the stable partition generated *by $\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof: The corollary follows from Proposition 8 and from the fact that if $*$ is an ergodic operation on $\mathcal{X}$ then every periodic partition is stable (see Lemma 3). ■

Remark 13. *The ergodicity condition in Corollary 2 cannot be replaced by irreducibility. Consider the irreducible (but not ergodic) operation $*$ of Remark 6, and let $\mathcal{A} = \big\{\{0,1\},\{2,3\}\big\}$. Notice that there is no stable partition that is both coarser than $\mathcal{A}$ and finer than every stable partition that is coarser than $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, if $*$ is not ergodic, the concept of "generated stable partitions" is not always well defined.*

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ which covers $\mathcal{X}$ and does not contain the empty set as an element. We have $\mathcal{A} \preceq \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle$ which implies that $\mathcal{A}^{n*} \preceq \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle^{n*}$ for every $n > 0$. Can we find $n > 0$ for which $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle^{n*}$? The rest of this section is dedicated to show that the answer to this question is affirmative if $*$ is strongly ergodic. This property of strongly ergodic operations turns out to be important for polarization theory as we will see in Part II of this paper [1].

Definition 16. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-*cover *if $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \bigcup_{A\in\mathcal{A}} A$. Define the relation $P_\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ as follows: $xP_\mathcal{A}y$ if and only if there exists a finite sequence $(A_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ such that $x \in A_1$, $y \in A_n$, $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $A_i \cap A_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i < n$. Clearly, $P_\mathcal{A}$ is an equivalence relation on $\mathcal{X}$. The set of equivalence classes of $P_\mathcal{A}$ (denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$) is called the partition of $\mathcal{X}$* generated by $\mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 14. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an $\mathcal{X}$-cover. For every $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, there exists a finite sequence $(A_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ such that $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i$, $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $A_i \cap A_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i < n$.*

Proof: Let $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ and let $x \in B$. We say that a sequence $(A_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ is $(x,\mathcal{A})$-connected if $x \in A_1$, $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $A_i \cap A_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i < n$. If $(A_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ is such a sequence, we clearly have $xP_\mathcal{A}y$ for every $y \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i$. Therefore, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i \subset B$.

Let $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $x \in A_1$. The sequence (A_1) of length 1 is $(x,\mathcal{A})$-connected. Therefore, there exists at least one $(x,\mathcal{A})$-connected sequence. Now consider an $(x,\mathcal{A})$-connected sequence $(A_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i$ is maximal. If $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i \neq B$, there exists $y \in B$ such that $y \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i$. Let $x' \in A_n$. Since $x', y \in B$, $x'P_\mathcal{A}y$ and so there exists a sequence $(A'_i)_{1\leq i\leq m}$ such that $x' \in A'_1$, $y \in A'_m$, $A'_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $A'_i \cap A'_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i < m$. Consider the sequence $(A''_i)_{1\leq i\leq n+m}$ defined by $A''_i = A_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $A''_i = A'_{i-n}$ for $n+1 \leq i \leq n+m$. Since $x' \in A_n \cap A'_1 = A''_n \cap A''_{n+1}$, $(A''_i)_{1\leq i\leq n+m}$ is $(x,\mathcal{A})$-connected. We have $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i \subsetneq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n+m} A''_i$ since $y \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{n+m} A''_i$ and $y \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i$. This contradicts the maximality of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i$. Therefore, we must have $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i = B$. ∎

Lemma 15. *Let $*$ be a uniformity preserving operation on a set $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be an $\mathcal{X}$-cover. For every $n > 0$ and every $A \in \mathcal{A}^{n*}$, there exists $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$ such that $A \subset B$.*

Proof: We will show the lemma by induction on n. The lemma is trivial for $n = 0$.

Now let $n > 0$ and suppose that the lemma is true for $n-1$. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}^{n*}$, there exists $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}^{(n-1)*}$ such that $A = A_1 * A_2$. The induction hypothesis implies the existence of two sets $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(n-1)*}$ such that $A_1 \subset B_1$ and $A_2 \subset B_2$. We have $A = A_1 * A_2 \subset B_1 * B_2$ and $B_1 * B_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$. ∎

Lemma 16. *Let $*$ be a uniformity preserving operation on a set $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be an $\mathcal{X}$-cover. For every $n \geq 0$, we have $\mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{n*})$.*

Proof: We will show the lemma by induction on n. The lemma is trivial for $n = 0$.

Now let $n > 0$ and suppose that $\mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(n-1)*}\big) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{(n-1)*})$, which means that for every $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $xP_{\mathcal{A}^{(n-1)*}}y$ if and only if $xP_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(n-1)*}}y$.

Let $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $xP_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}}y$. There exists a sequence $(D_j)_{1\leq j\leq m}$ such that: $x \in D_1$, $y \in D_m$, $D_j \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$, and $D_j \cap D_{j+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq j < m$. Define $x_1 = x$ and $x_{m+1} = y$, and for each $2 \leq j \leq m$, choose $x_j \in D_{j-1} \cap D_j$. For every $1 \leq j \leq m$, we have $x_j, x_{j+1} \in D_j$ and $D_j \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$. We are going to show that $x_j P_{\mathcal{A}^{n*}} x_{j+1}$ for every $1 \leq j \leq m$ which will imply that $xP_{\mathcal{A}^{n*}}y$.

Fix $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Since $D_j \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$, there exist $D'_j, D''_j \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(n-1)*}$ such that $D_j = D'_j * D''_j$. Moreover, since $x_j, x_{j+1} \in D_j$ there exist $a'_j, b'_{j+1} \in D'_j$ and $a''_j, b''_{j+1} \in D''_j$ such that $x_j = a'_j * a''_j$ and $x_{j+1} = b'_{j+1} * b''_{j+1}$. We have $a'_j P_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(n-1)*}} b'_{j+1}$ and $a''_j P_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(n-1)*}} b''_{j+1}$. Therefore, from the induction hypothesis we have $a'_j P_{\mathcal{A}^{(n-1)*}} b'_{j+1}$ and $a''_j P_{\mathcal{A}^{(n-1)*}} b''_{j+1}$. There exist two sequences $(A'_i)_{1\leq i\leq m'_j}$ and $(A''_i)_{1\leq i\leq m''_j}$ such that:

- $a'_j \in A'_1$, $b'_{j+1} \in A'_{m'_j}$, $A'_i \in \mathcal{A}^{(n-1)*}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m'_j$, and $A'_i \cap A'_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i < m'_j$.
- $a''_j \in A''_1$, $b''_{j+1} \in A''_{m''_j}$, $A''_i \in \mathcal{A}^{(n-1)*}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m''_j$, and $A''_i \cap A''_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i < m''_j$.

Now consider the sequence $(A_i)_{1\leq i\leq m'_j+m''_j}$ defined as $A_i = A'_i * A''_1$ for $1 \leq i \leq m'_j$, and $A_i = A'_{m'_j} * A''_{i-m'_j}$ for $m'_j + 1 \leq i \leq m'_j + m''_j$. The sequence $(A_i)_{1\leq i\leq m'_j+m''_j}$ satisfies the following: $x_j = a'_j * a''_j \in A_1$, $x_{j+1} = b'_{j+1} * b''_{j+1} \in A_{m'_j+m''_j}$ and $A_i \in \mathcal{A}^{n*}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m'_j + m''_j$. Moreover, it is easy to see that $A_i \cap A_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i < m'_j + m''_j$. Therefore, $x_j P_{\mathcal{A}^{n*}} x_{j+1}$. Now since this is true for all $1 \leq j \leq m$, we have $x_1 P_{\mathcal{A}^{n*}} x_{m+1}$ and so $xP_{\mathcal{A}^{n*}}y$. We conclude that for every $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, $xP_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}}y$ implies $xP_{\mathcal{A}^{n*}}y$.

Now let $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $xP_{\mathcal{A}^{n*}}y$. There exists a sequence $(E_i)_{1\leq i\leq k}$ such that: $x \in E_1$, $y \in E_k$, $E_i \in \mathcal{A}^{n*}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $E_i \cap E_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i < k$. Now for every $1 \leq i \leq k$, we can apply Lemma 15 to get a set $F_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$ such that $E_i \subset F_i$. Clearly, we have $x \in F_1$, $y \in F_k$, $F_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $F_i \cap F_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i < k$. Thus, $xP_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}}y$.

We conclude that for every $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, $xP_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}}y$ if and only if $xP_{\mathcal{A}^{n*}}y$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{n*})$. ■

Definition 17. *We say that an $\mathcal{X}$-cover $\mathcal{A}$ is* periodic *if $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \mathcal{A}$ for some $n > 0$. The least integer $n > 0$ satisfying $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \mathcal{A}$ is called the* period *of $\mathcal{A}$, and it is denoted by* $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A})$.

We say that an $\mathcal{X}$-cover $\mathcal{A}$ is balanced *if for every $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $|A_1| = |A_2|$. An $\mathcal{X}$-cover $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be* stable *if it is both periodic and balanced.*

Lemma 17. *Let $*$ be an ergodic operation on a set $\mathcal{X}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a periodic $\mathcal{X}$-cover, then $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ is a stable partition.*

Proof: Let $n = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A}) \cdot \mathrm{con}(*)$. Since $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A})$ divides n, we have $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \mathcal{A}$. Let $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ be chosen so that $|A|$ is maximal, and let $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. We clearly have $|B| \leq |A|$. We also have $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{n*})$ since $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \mathcal{A}$. From Lemma 16 we have $\mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{n*})$, and so $B \in \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{n*}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$.

Fix $x \in A$ and $y \in B$. Since $n \geq \mathrm{con}(*)$, there exists a sequence $x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $y = (\ldots((x * x_0) * x_1) \ldots * x_{n-1})$. Now choose $X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1}$ such that $x_i \in X_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{i*}$ for $0 \leq i < n$. Define $C := (\ldots((A * X_0) * X_1) \ldots * X_{n-1})$. Clearly, $y \in C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$. Now since $y \in B \in \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big)$ and $y \in C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$, we must have $C = (\ldots((A * X_0) * X_1) \ldots * X_{n-1}) \subset B$ and so $|A| \leq |C| \leq |B|$, which implies that $|A| = |B| = |C|$ since we already have $|B| \leq |A|$. Therefore, $C = B$ and so $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$ for every $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, from which we conclude that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$. On the other hand, since $|A| = |B|$ for every $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ is a balanced partition.

Now for every $C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$, there exists a set $D \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ and a sequence $X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1}$ such that $X_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{i*}$ and $C = (\ldots((D * X_0) * X_1) \ldots * X_{n-1})$. We have $|D| \leq |C|$. On the other hand, Lemma 15 (applied to the $\mathcal{X}$-cover $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$) implies the existence of a set $B \in \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big)$ such that $C \subset B$. Therefore, $|D| \leq |C| \leq |B|$. Now since $\mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{n*})$ (by Lemma 16) and $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \mathcal{A}$, we have $B \in \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{n*}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. Therefore, $|D| = |B|$ since $D, B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ and since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ was shown to be a balanced partition. Thus, $|B| = |C| = |D|$ which implies that $C = B \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ since $C \subset B$. We conclude that $C \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ for every $C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. This means that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ since we already have $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$. We conclude that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ is a stable partition. ■

Lemma 18. *Let $*$ be an ergodic operation on a set $\mathcal{X}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a periodic $\mathcal{X}$-cover, then $\mathcal{A}$ is stable. Moreover, for every $i \geq 0$, every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and every $B \in \mathcal{A}^{i*}$, we have $|A| = |B|$.*

Proof: The exact same proof of Lemma 3 can be applied here to show the lemma. ■

Lemma 19. *Let $*$ be an ergodic operation on a set $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a periodic $\mathcal{X}$-cover. For every $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$, if $B \cap C \neq \emptyset$ then $A * B = A * C$.*

Proof: We have $A * B \in \mathcal{A}^*$, and from Lemma 18 we get $|A * B| = |A|$. On the other hand, since $*$ is uniformity preserving, we have $|A * x| = |A|$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Now since $A * B = \bigcup_{b \in B} A * b$, and since $|A * b| = |A| = |A * B|$ for every $b \in B$, we must have $A * B = A * b$ for every $b \in B$. Similarly, $A * C = A * c$ for every $c \in C$. We conclude that $A * B = A * C$ since $B \cap C \neq \emptyset$ (take any $x \in B \cap C$, we have $A * B = A * x = A * C$). ■

Lemma 20. *Let $*$ be an ergodic operation on a set $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a periodic $\mathcal{X}$-cover. For every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and every $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, we have $A * B \in \mathcal{A}^*$.*

Proof: According to Lemma 14 there exists a finite sequence $(A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq l}$ such that $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} A_i$, $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$, and $A_i \cap A_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i < l$. Lemma 19 shows that $A * A_1 = A * A_2 = \ldots = A * A_l$. Therefore, $A * B = A * A_1 \in \mathcal{A}^*$. ■

Lemma 21. *Let $*$ be an ergodic operation on a set $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a periodic $\mathcal{X}$-cover. For every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and every $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}$, we have $A * \mathfrak{X} \in \mathcal{A}^{|\mathfrak{X}|*}$.*

Proof: We will prove the lemma by induction on $k = |\mathfrak{X}| > 0$. Lemma 20 implies that the statement is true for $k = 1$. Now let $k > 1$ and suppose that the lemma is true for $|\mathfrak{X}| = k - 1$. Now let $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < k}$ be a $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$-sequence of length k. Define $\mathfrak{X}' = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < k-1}$. We have:

- $A' = A * \mathfrak{X}' \in \mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*}$ from the induction hypothesis.
- Lemma 17 shows that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ is a stable partition, and so $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(k-1)*}$ is also a stable partition. In particular, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(k-1)*}$ is a partition and so $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(k-1)*} = \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(k-1)*}\big)$. On the other hand, Lemma 16 shows that $\mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(k-1)*}\big) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(k-1)*} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*})$. We conclude that $X_{k-1} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*})$ since we have $X_{k-1} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{(k-1)*}$.
- Since $(\mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*})^{n*} = (\mathcal{A}^{n*})^{(k-1)*} = \mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*}$ (where $n = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A})$), $\mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*}$ is a periodic $\mathcal{X}$-cover.

Now since $A' \in \mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*}$ and $X_{k-1} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*})$, and since $\mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*}$ is a periodic $\mathcal{X}$-cover, we can apply Lemma 20 to obtain $A' * X_{k-1} \in (\mathcal{A}^{(k-1)*})^* = \mathcal{A}^{k*}$. We conclude that $A * \mathfrak{X} = A' * X_{k-1} \in \mathcal{A}^{k*}$ which completes the induction argument. ■

Proposition 9. *If $*$ is a strongly ergodic operation on a set $\mathcal{X}$, then every periodic $\mathcal{X}$-cover is a stable partition.*

Proof: Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a periodic $\mathcal{X}$-cover. Lemma 17 shows that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ is a stable partition. Let $n = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A}).\,\mathrm{scon}(*)$. We have the following:

- $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*} = \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big)$ since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ is a stable partition.
- $\mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}\big) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{n*})$ by Lemma 16.
- $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \mathcal{A}$ since $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A})$ divides n.

Therefore, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}^{n*}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$.

Fix $A \in \mathcal{A}$. From Lemma 15 there exists $B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $A \subset B$. Fix let $a \in A$. Since $a \in B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})^{n*}$ and since $n \geq \mathrm{scon}(*)$, we can apply Theorem 2 to get a $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$-sequence of length n such that $a * \mathfrak{X} = B * \mathfrak{X} = B$. Since $B = a * \mathfrak{X} \subset A * \mathfrak{X} \subset B * \mathfrak{X} = B$, we have $A * \mathfrak{X} = B$. Now from Lemma 21, we have $A * \mathfrak{X} \in \mathcal{A}^{n*} = \mathcal{A}$, and Lemma 18 implies that $|A| = |A * \mathfrak{X}| = |B|$. Thus, $A = B$ since we have $A \subset B$ and $|A| = |B|$.

We conclude that $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, which proves that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{A}$ is a stable partition. ■

Remark 14. *The strong ergodicity condition in Proposition 9 cannot be replaced by ergodicity. Consider the following ergodic (but not strongly ergodic) operation:*

$*$	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	3	3	3	0	0	0
1	4	4	4	1	1	1
2	5	5	5	2	2	2
3	1	1	1	5	5	5
4	2	2	2	3	3	3
5	0	0	0	4	4	4

The set $\big\{\{0,1\},\{0,2\},\{1,2\},\{3,4\},\{3,5\},\{4,5\}\big\}$ *is a periodic* $\mathcal{X}$*-cover of period 1, but it is not a partition.*

Theorem 3. *Let* $*$ *be a strongly ergodic operation on a set* $\mathcal{X}$*. For every* $\mathcal{X}$*-cover* $\mathcal{A}$*, there exists an integer* $n < 2^{2^{|\mathcal{X}|}}$ *such that* $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle$ *and* $\mathrm{per}(\langle\mathcal{A}\rangle)$ *divides* n*, i.e.,* $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle = \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle^{n*}$*.*

Proof: $2^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ is the number of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$, and $2^{2^{|\mathcal{X}|}}$ is the number of sets of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$. Thus, the sets $\mathcal{A}^{i*}$ for $0 \leq i \leq 2^{2^{|\mathcal{X}|}}$ cannot be pairwise different. Therefore, there exist at least two integers $0 \leq n_1 < n_2 \leq 2^{2^{|\mathcal{X}|}}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{n_1*} = \mathcal{A}^{n_2*}$. Since $(\mathcal{A}^{n_1*})^{(n_2-n_1)*} = \mathcal{A}^{n_1*}$, $\mathcal{A}^{n_1*}$ is a stable partition by Proposition 9. There exists an integer n_3 such that $0 \leq n_3 < n_2 - n_1$ and $n_3 \equiv -n_1 \bmod (n_2 - n_1)$. Let $n = n_1 + n_3$, we have $n_1 \leq n < n_2 \leq 2^{2^{|\mathcal{X}|}}$, $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = (\mathcal{A}^{n_1*})^{n_3*}$ is a stable partition, and $n_2 - n_1$ divides n. But since $(\mathcal{A}^{n_1*})^{(n_2-n_1)*} = \mathcal{A}^{n_2*} = \mathcal{A}^{n_1*}$, $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A}^{n_1*})$ divides $n_2 - n_1$ which divides n. On the other hand, $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A}^{n_1*}) = \mathrm{per}\left((\mathcal{A}^{n_1*})^{n_3*}\right) = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A}^{n*})$. We conclude that $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A}^{n*})$ divides n.

Now let $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and let a be an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{X}$. Define the mapping $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ as $\pi(x) = x * a$. Since π is a permutation, there exists $k > 0$ such that $\pi^k(x) = x$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Now for every $0 \leq i < kn$, let $X_i \in \mathcal{A}^{i*}$ be such that $a \in X_i$ and let $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < kn}$. We have:

- $A * \mathfrak{X} \in \mathcal{A}^{kn*}$.
- $A \subset A * \mathfrak{X}$ since $\pi^{kn}(x) = x$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
- $\mathcal{A}^{kn*} = (\mathcal{A}^{n*})^{(k-1)n*} = \mathcal{A}^{n*}$ since $\mathcal{A}^{n*}$ is a stable partition whose period divides n (and so divides $(k-1)n$ as well).

We conclude that $A \subset A * \mathfrak{X} \in \mathcal{A}^{n*}$. Therefore, $A \preceq \mathcal{A}^{n*}$. Now since $\mathcal{A}^{n*}$ is a stable partition, we must have $\langle\mathcal{A}\rangle \preceq \mathcal{A}^{n*}$. On the other hand, we have:

- Since $\mathcal{A} \preceq \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle$ then $\mathcal{A}^{np*} \preceq \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle^{np*}$, where $p = \mathrm{per}(\langle\mathcal{A}\rangle)$.
- $\mathcal{A}^{np*} = (\mathcal{A}^{n*})^{(p-1)n*} \overset{(a)}{=} \mathcal{A}^{n*}$, where (a) follows from the fact that n divides $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A}^{n*})$.
- $\langle\mathcal{A}\rangle^{np*} = \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle$ since $p = \mathrm{per}(\langle\mathcal{A}\rangle)$.

We conclude that $\mathcal{A}^{n*} \preceq \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle$, which implies that $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle$ as we have already shown that $\langle\mathcal{A}\rangle \preceq \mathcal{A}^{n*}$. ■

Remark 15. *The strong ergodicity condition in Theorem 3 cannot be replaced by ergodicity. Consider the ergodic operation* $*$ *of Remark 14, and consider the the* $\mathcal{X}$*-cover*

$$\mathcal{A} = \big\{\{0,1\},\{0,2\},\{1,2\},\{3,4\},\{3,5\},\{4,5\}\big\},$$

which is not a partition. We have the following:

- *It is easy to see that* $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \mathcal{A}$ *for every* $n \geq 0$*.*
- *Since* $\mathcal{A}$ *is not a partition,* $\mathcal{A}^{n*} = \mathcal{A}$ *is not a partition for every* $n \geq 0$*.*

Therefore, $\mathcal{A}^{n*} \neq \langle\mathcal{A}\rangle^{n*}$ *for every* $n \geq 0$*.*

VIII. Product of binary operations

Definition 18. *Let $\mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_m$ be m sets, and let $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ be m binary operations on $\mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_m$ respectively. We define the product of $*_1, \ldots, *_m$, denoted $* = *_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$, as the binary operation $*$ on $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_m$ defined by:*

$$(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m) * (x'_1, x'_2, \ldots, x'_m) = (x_1 *_1 x'_1, x_2 *_2 x'_2, \ldots, x_m *_m x'_m).$$

Proposition 10. *Let $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ be m binary operations on $\mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_m$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_m$ and $* = *_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$. We have:*

1) *$*$ is uniformity preserving if and only if $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ are uniformity preserving.*
2) *If $*$ is irreducible then $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ are irreducible. The converse is not necessarily true.*
3) *$*$ is ergodic if and only if $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ are ergodic. Moreover, $\operatorname{con}(*) = \max\{\operatorname{con}(*_1), \ldots, \operatorname{con}(*_m)\}$.*

Proof: 1) Suppose that $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ are uniformity preserving. Fix $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_m) \in \mathcal{X}$ and define the mapping $\pi_b : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ as $\pi_b(x) = x * b$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Now let $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_m) \in \mathcal{X}$. For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, $*_i$ is uniformity preserving and so there exists $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ such that $x_i *_i b_i = y_i$. Define $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$. We have $\pi_b(x) = x * b = y$. Therefore, π_b is surjective which implies that it is bijective. Since this is true for every $b \in \mathcal{X}$, $*$ is uniformity preserving.

Conversely, suppose that $*$ is uniformity preserving and let $1 \leq i \leq m$. Fix $b_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and define the mapping $\pi_{b_i} : \mathcal{X}_i \to \mathcal{X}_i$ as $\pi_{b_i}(x_i) = x_i *_i b_i$ for all $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$. Now let $y_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and choose arbitrarily $y_j \in \mathcal{X}_j$ for each $j \neq i$. Define $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_m) \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $*$ is uniformity preserving, there exists $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $y = x * b$ which implies that $y_i = x_i *_i b_i$. Therefore, π_{b_i} is surjective which implies that it is bijective. Since this is true for every $b_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, $*_i$ is uniformity preserving.

2) Suppose that $*$ is irreducible and fix $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $a_i, b_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and choose arbitrarily $a_j, b_j \in \mathcal{X}_j$ for each $j \neq i$. Define $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \in \mathcal{X}$ and $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_m) \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $*$ is irreducible, a is $*$-connectable to b and so there exists $l > 0$ and $x_0, \ldots, x_{l-1} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $b = (\ldots((a * x_0) * x_1) \ldots * x_{l-1})$. For each $0 \leq k < l$, let $x_k = (x_{1,k}, \ldots, x_{m,k})$ and so $x_{i,k} \in \mathcal{X}_i$. It is easy to see that we have $b_i = (\ldots((a_i *_i x_{i,0}) *_i x_{i,1}) \ldots *_i x_{i,l-1})$. Therefore, a_i is $*_i$-connectable to b_i for all $a_i, b_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, hence $*_i$ is irreducible.

In order to see that the converse is not necessarily true, let $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ and define $x *_1 y = x *_2 y = x \oplus 1$ for every $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$. It is easy to see that $*_1$ and $*_2$ are irreducible and $\operatorname{per}(*_1) = \operatorname{per}(*_2) = 2$. Let $* = *_1 \otimes *_2$. It is easy to see that $(0, 0)$ is not $*$-connectable to $(0, 1)$. Therefore, $*$ is not irreducible.

3) Suppose that $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ are ergodic and let $d = \max\{\operatorname{con}(*_1), \ldots, \operatorname{con}(*_m)\}$. Let $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \in \mathcal{X}$ and $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_m) \in \mathcal{X}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq m$, since $d \geq \operatorname{con}(*_i)$ there exist $x_{i,0}, \ldots, x_{i,d-1} \in \mathcal{X}_i$ such that $b_i = (\ldots((a_i *_i x_{i,0}) *_i x_{i,1}) \ldots *_i x_{i,d-1})$. For each $0 \leq k < d$ define $x_k = (x_{1,k}, \ldots, x_{m,k}) \in \mathcal{X}$. It is easy to see that $b = (\ldots((a * x_0) * x_1) \ldots * x_{d-1})$. Therefore, all the elements of $\mathcal{X}$ are $*$-connectable to each other in d steps. We conclude that $*$ is ergodic and $\operatorname{con}(*) \leq d = \max\{\operatorname{con}(*_1), \ldots, \operatorname{con}(*_m)\}$.

Conversely, suppose that $*$ is ergodic and let $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $a_i, b_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and choose arbitrarily $a_j, b_j \in \mathcal{X}_j$ for each $j \neq i$. Define $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \in \mathcal{X}$ and $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_m) \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $*$ is ergodic, a is $*$-connectable to b in $\operatorname{con}(*)$ steps. It follows that a_i is $*_i$-connectable to b_i in $\operatorname{con}(*)$ steps (we use the same argument that we used for the irreducible case). Since this is true for every $a_i, b_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, we conclude that $*_i$ is ergodic and $\operatorname{con}(*_i) \leq \operatorname{con}(*)$. We conclude that $\max\{\operatorname{con}(*_1), \ldots, \operatorname{con}(*_m)\} \leq \operatorname{con}(*)$ which implies that $\operatorname{con}(*) = \max\{\operatorname{con}(*_1), \ldots, \operatorname{con}(*_m)\}$ since we have $\operatorname{con}(*) \leq \max\{\operatorname{con}(*_1), \ldots, \operatorname{con}(*_m)\}$ from the previous paragraph. ∎

Definition 19. *Let $\mathcal{H}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_m$ be m stable partitions of $(\mathcal{X}_1, *_1), \ldots, (\mathcal{X}_m, *_m)$ respectively. The product of $\mathcal{H}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_m$, denoted $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_m$ is defined as*

$$\mathcal{H} = \{A_1 \times \ldots \times A_m : \ A_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1, \ldots, A_m \in \mathcal{H}_m\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{H}$ is a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_m, *_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m)$ of period $\operatorname{per}(\mathcal{H}) = \operatorname{lcm}\{\operatorname{per}(\mathcal{H}_1), \ldots, \operatorname{per}(\mathcal{H}_m)\}$.

Theorem 4. *Let $*_1$ and $*_2$ be two ergodic operations on $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ and $* = *_1 \otimes *_2$ (thus, $*$ is ergodic). Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $\mathcal{X}$. There exist two unique stable partitions $\mathcal{L}_1 := \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_1 := \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ of $\mathcal{X}_1$ and two unique stable partitions $\mathcal{L}_2 := \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_2 := \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ of $\mathcal{X}_2$ such that:*

- *$\mathcal{L}_1 \preceq \mathcal{U}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2 \preceq \mathcal{U}_2$ and $\frac{||\mathcal{U}_1||}{||\mathcal{L}_1||} = \frac{||\mathcal{U}_2||}{||\mathcal{L}_2||} = n$ for some integer $n > 0$.*
- *$\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes \mathcal{L}_2 \preceq \mathcal{H} \preceq \mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2$.*
- *For every $H \in \mathcal{H}$, there exist n disjoint sets $H_{1,1}, \ldots, H_{1,n} \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and n disjoint sets $H_{2,1}, \ldots, H_{2,n} \in \mathcal{L}_2$ such that:*
  - *$H_{1,1} \cup \ldots \cup H_{1,n} \in \mathcal{U}_1$.*
  - *$H_{2,1} \cup \ldots \cup H_{2,n} \in \mathcal{U}_2$.*
  - *$H = (H_{1,1} \times H_{2,1}) \cup \ldots \cup (H_{1,n} \times H_{2,n})$.*

  Therefore, $||\mathcal{H}|| = n \cdot ||\mathcal{L}_1|| \cdot ||\mathcal{L}_2|| = ||\mathcal{L}_1|| \cdot ||\mathcal{U}_2|| = ||\mathcal{U}_1|| \cdot ||\mathcal{L}_2||$.

The integer n is called the correlation *of $\mathcal{H}$ and is denoted by $\mathrm{cor}_{*_1,*_2}(\mathcal{H})$.*

We also have $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$, $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})^{i*_2} = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$, $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ and $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})^{i*_2} = \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ for every $i \geq 0$.

Remark 16. *If $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, then $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{H}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{H}_2$ and $\mathrm{cor}_{*_1,*_2}(\mathcal{H}) = 1$.*

Example 2. *The following figure shows an element H of a stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ of correlation $n = \mathrm{cor}_{*_1,*_2}(\mathcal{H}) = 3$. H is represented by the regions that are enclosed in thick lines.*



Fig. 1: $H = (H_{1,1} \times H_{2,1}) \cup (H_{1,2} \times H_{2,2}) \cup (H_{1,3} \times H_{2,3}) \in \mathcal{H}$.

Example 3. *Let $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2 = \{0,1\}$ and define $*_1$ and $*_2$ as $x *_1 y = x *_2 y = x \oplus y$ for every $x, y \in \{0,1\}$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$, $* = *_1 \otimes *_2$ and $\mathcal{H} = \big\{\{(0,0),(1,1)\},\{(0,1),(1,0)\}\big\}$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{H}$ is a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$. We have:*

- *$\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}) = \big\{\{0\},\{1\}\big\}$.*
- *$\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H}) = \big\{\{0,1\}\big\}$.*
- *$n = \mathrm{cor}_{*_1,*_2}(\mathcal{H}) = 2$.*

For $H = \{(0,1),(1,0)\} \in \mathcal{H}$, we have:

- *$H_{1,1} = \{0\}$, $H_{1,2} = \{1\}$ and $H_{1,1} \cup H_{1,2} = \{0,1\} \in \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$.*
- *$H_{2,1} = \{1\}$, $H_{2,2} = \{0\}$ and $H_{2,1} \cup H_{2,2} = \{0,1\} \in \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$.*
- *$(H_{1,1} \times H_{2,1}) \cup (H_{1,2} \times H_{2,2}) = \{(0,1),(1,0)\} = H$.*

In order to prove Theorem 4, we need a few definitions and lemmas:

Definition 20. *Define the two projection mappings $P_1 : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}_1$ and $P_2 : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}_2$ as $P_1(x_1, x_2) = x_1$ and $P_2(x_1, x_2) = x_2$ for all $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}$. Define the following:*

- *$\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \{P_1(H) : \ H \in \mathcal{H}\}$.*

- $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H}) = \{P_2(H) :\ H \in \mathcal{H}\}$.

Lemma 22. *For every $x_2, x_2' \in \mathcal{X}_2$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ such that:*

- *For every $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$, we have $(x_1, x_2') \in (x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}$.*
- *For every $X \subset \mathcal{X}$, we have $P_1(X) \subset P_1(X * \mathfrak{X})$.*

We say that the sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ can take the second coordinate from x_2 to x_2' while keeping the first coordinate unchanged.

Proof: Let $k = \operatorname{per}(\mathcal{H})\operatorname{con}(*_2) \geq \operatorname{con}(*_2)$. Choose arbitrarily a sequence of k elements $x_{1,0}, \ldots, x_{1,k-1}$ in $\mathcal{X}_1$ and define the mapping $\pi : \mathcal{X}_1 \to \mathcal{X}_1$ as $\pi(x_1) = (\ldots((x_1 *_1 x_{1,0}) *_1 x_{1,1}) \ldots *_1 x_{1,k-1})$. Since π is a permutation of $\mathcal{X}_1$, there exists an integer $s > 0$ such that $\pi^s(x_1) = x_1$ for all $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$. Let $l = ks$ and define the sequence $x_{1,i}$ for $k \leq i < l$ as $x_{1,i} = x_{1,i \bmod k}$. Clearly,

$$(\ldots((x_1 *_1 x_{1,0}) *_1 x_{1,1}) \ldots *_1 x_{1,l-1}) = \pi^s(x_1) = x_1 \text{ for all } x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1. \tag{12}$$

Now since $l \geq k \geq \operatorname{con}(*_2)$ and since $*_2$ is ergodic, there exists a sequence $(x_{2,i})_{0 \leq i < l}$ in $\mathcal{X}_2$ such that

$$x_2' = (\ldots((x_2 *_2 x_{2,0}) *_2 x_{2,1}) \ldots *_2 x_{2,l-1}). \tag{13}$$

Define the $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < l}$ such that $(x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}) \in X_i \in \mathcal{H}^{i*}$ for all $0 \leq i < l$. For every $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$, we have:

$$(x_1, x_2') \overset{(a)}{=} (x_1, x_2) * \Big((x_{1,i}, x_{2,i})_{0 \leq i < l}\Big) \overset{(b)}{\in} (x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X},$$

where (a) follows from (12) and (13), and (b) follows from the fact that $(x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}) \in X_i$ for all $0 \leq i < l$.

Now let $X \subset \mathfrak{X}$. We have:

$$P_1(X) \overset{(a)}{=} (\ldots((P_1(X) *_1 x_{1,0}) *_1 x_{1,1}) \ldots *_1 x_{1,l-1}) \overset{(b)}{=} P_1(X * (x_{1,i}, x_{2,i})_{0 \leq i < l}) \overset{(c)}{\subset} P_1(X * \mathfrak{X}),$$

where (a) follows from (12), (b) follows from the definition of $*$ and P_1, and (c) follows from the fact that $(x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}) \in X_i$ for all $0 \leq i < l$. ∎

Lemma 23. *Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be an $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence which takes the second coordinate from x_2 to x_2' while keeping the first coordinate unchanged as in Lemma 22. If there exist $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}$ and $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$ such that $(x_1, x_2) \in H$ and $(x_1, x_2') \in H'$, then $H' = H * \mathfrak{X}$.*

Proof: From Lemma 22 we have $(x_1, x_2') \in (x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X} \subset H * \mathfrak{X}$. Therefore, $H' \cap (H * \mathfrak{X}) \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, we have $H' \in \mathcal{H}$ and $H * \mathfrak{X} \in \mathcal{H}^{|\mathfrak{X}|*} = \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, $H' = H * \mathfrak{X}$ since $\mathcal{H}$ is a partition. ∎

Lemma 24. *$\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ (resp. $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$) is a partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}_2$).*

Proof: Clearly, $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ covers $\mathcal{X}_1$. Now suppose that there exist $A, B \in \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ such that $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and let $x_1 \in A \cap B$. Let $H_A, H_B \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $P_1(H_A) = A$ and $P_1(H_B) = B$. There exist $x_{2,A} \in \mathcal{X}_2$ and $x_{2,B} \in \mathcal{X}_2$ such that $(x_1, x_{2,A}) \in H_A$ and $(x_1, x_{2,B}) \in H_B$. Using Lemma 22, choose an $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ which can take the second coordinate from $x_{2,A}$ to $x_{2,B}$ while keeping the first coordinate unchanged.

Lemma 23 shows that $H_B = H_A * \mathfrak{X}$ and Lemma 22 implies that $P_1(H_A) \subset P_1(H_A * \mathfrak{X})$. We conclude that $A = P_1(H_A) \subset P_1(H_A * \mathfrak{X}) = P_1(H_B) = B$. By exchanging the roles of A and B, we can also get $B \subset A$. Therefore, $A = B$. We conclude that $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$. A similar argument shows that $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ is a partition of $\mathcal{X}_2$. ∎

Lemma 25. *$\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ (resp. $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$) is a stable partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}_2$) of period at most $\operatorname{per}(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, for every $i \geq 0$, we have $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ and $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})^{i*_2} = \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$.*

Proof: We will only prove the lemma for $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ since the proof for $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ is similar. We will start by showing by induction on $i \geq 0$ that $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$. The claim is trivial for $i = 0$. Now let $i > 0$ and suppose that the claim is true for $i - 1$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} &= \big(\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{(i-1)*_1}\big)^{*_1} \overset{(a)}{=} \big(\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*})\big)^{*_1} = \{H'_1 *_1 H''_1 :\ H'_1, H''_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*})\} \\ &= \{P_1(H') *_1 P_1(H'') :\ H', H'' \in \mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*}\} \overset{(b)}{=} \{P_1(H' * H'') :\ H', H'' \in \mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*}\} \\ &= \{P_1(H) :\ H \in \mathcal{H}^{i*}\} = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*}),\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the induction hypothesis and (b) follows from the identity $P_1(H') *_1 P_1(H'') = P_1(H' * H'')$ which is very easy to check. We conclude that we have $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ for all $i \geq 0$. In particular, for $p = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$, we have $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{p*_1} = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{p*}) = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$.

Lemma 24 shows that $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a partition, and we have just shown that $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{p*_1} = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is periodic of period at most p. Lemma 3 now implies that $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a stable partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$. ■

Definition 21. *Let $X \subset \mathcal{X}$, $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2$. Define the sets $P_{1|x_2}(X) \subset \mathcal{X}_1$ and $P_{2|x_1}(X) \subset \mathcal{X}_2$ as:*

- $P_{1|x_2}(X) = \{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1 :\ (x_1, x_2) \in X\} = P_1\big(X \cap (\mathcal{X}_1 \times \{x_2\})\big)$.
- $P_{2|x_1}(X) = \{x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2 :\ (x_1, x_2) \in X\} = P_2\big(X \cap (\{x_1\} \times \mathcal{X}_2)\big)$.

Define the following:

- $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \{P_{1|x_2}(H) :\ H \in \mathcal{H},\ x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2,\ P_{1|x_2}(H) \neq \emptyset\}$.
- $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}) = \{P_{2|x_1}(H) :\ H \in \mathcal{H},\ x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1,\ P_{2|x_1}(H) \neq \emptyset\}$.

Lemma 26. *$\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$) is a partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}_2$).*

Proof: Clearly, $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ covers $\mathcal{X}_1$. Suppose that there exist $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ such that $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and let $x_1 \in A \cap B$. Let $H_A, H_B \in \mathcal{H}$ and $x_{2,A}, x_{2,B} \in \mathcal{X}_2$ be such that $A = P_{1|x_{2,A}}(H_A)$ and $B = P_{2|x_{2,B}}(H_B)$. Using Lemma 22, choose an $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ which can take the second coordinate from $x_{2,A}$ to $x_{2,B}$ while keeping the first coordinate unchanged.

Since $x_1 \in A = P_{1|x_{2,A}}(H_A)$ and $x_1 \in B = P_{1|x_{2,B}}(H_B)$, we have $(x_1, x_{2,A}) \in H_A$ and $(x_1, x_{2,B}) \in H_B$. It follows from Lemma 23 that $H_B = H_A * \mathfrak{X}$.

Now for every $x'_1 \in A = P_{1|x_{2,A}}(H_A)$, we have $(x'_1, x_{2,A}) \in H_A$ and so by Lemma 22 we have $(x'_1, x_{2,B}) \in (x'_1, x_{2,A}) * \mathfrak{X} \subset H_A * \mathfrak{X} = H_B$. We conclude that $x'_1 \in P_{1|x_{2,B}}(H_B) = B$ for every $x'_1 \in A$. Therefore, $A \subset B$. By exchanging the roles of A and B we can also get $B \subset A$ which implies that $A = B$. We conclude that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$. A similar argument shows that $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ is a partition of $\mathcal{X}_2$. ■

Lemma 27. *$\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$) is a balanced partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}_2$).*

Proof: Let $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$. There exist $H_A, H_B \in \mathcal{H}$ and $x_{2,A}, x_{2,B} \in \mathcal{X}_2$ such that $A = P_{1|x_{2,A}}(H_A)$ and $B = P_{2|x_{2,B}}(H_B)$. Fix $x_{1,A} \in A$ and $x_{1,B} \in B$ and define $k = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) \cdot \max\{\mathrm{con}(*_1), \mathrm{con}(*_2)\}$. Clearly, $(x_{1,A}, x_{2,A}) \in H_A$ and $(x_{1,B}, x_{2,B}) \in H_B$.

Since $k \geq \mathrm{con}(*_1)$ and $k \geq \mathrm{con}(*_2)$, and since $*_1$ and $*_2$ are ergodic, there exist a sequence $(x_{1,i})_{0 \leq i < k}$ in $\mathcal{X}_1$ and a sequence $(x_{2,i})_{0 \leq i < k}$ in $\mathcal{X}_2$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}(\ldots((x_{1,A} *_1 x_{1,0}) *_1 x_{1,1}) \ldots *_1 x_{1,k-1}) &= x_{1,B}, \\ (\ldots((x_{2,A} *_2 x_{2,0}) *_2 x_{2,1}) \ldots *_2 x_{2,k-1}) &= x_{2,B}.\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Now define the $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable sequence $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < k}$ such that $(x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}) \in X_i \in \mathcal{H}^{i*}$ for all $0 \leq i < k$. We have:

$$(x_{1,B}, x_{2,B}) \overset{(a)}{=} (x_{1,A}, x_{2,A}) * \Big((x_{1,i}, x_{2,i})_{0 \leq i < k}\Big) \overset{(b)}{\in} H_A * \mathfrak{X},$$

where (a) follows from (14) and (b) follows from the fact that $(x_{1,A}, x_{2,A}) \in H_A$ and $(x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}) \in X_i$ for every $0 \leq i < k$. We conclude that $H_B \cap (H_A * \mathfrak{X}) \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, we have $H_B \in \mathcal{H}$ and $H_A * \mathfrak{X} \in \mathcal{H}^{k*} = \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, $H_B = H_A * \mathfrak{X}$ since $\mathcal{H}$ is a partition.

Define the mapping $\pi_1 : \mathcal{X}_1 \to \mathcal{X}_1$ as $\pi_1(x_1) = (\dots((x_1 *_1 x_{1,0}) *_1 x_{1,1}) \dots *_1 x_{1,k-1})$ for every $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and the mapping $\pi_2 : \mathcal{X}_2 \to \mathcal{X}_2$ as $\pi_2(x_2) = (\dots((x_2 *_2 x_{2,0}) *_2 x_{2,1}) \dots *_2 x_{2,k-1})$ for every $x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2$.

Now let $x_1 \in A = P_{1|x_{2,A}}(H_A)$, we have:

$$(\pi_1(x_1), x_{2,B}) \overset{(a)}{=} (\pi_1(x_1), \pi_2(x_{1,A})) \overset{(b)}{=} (x_1, x_{2,A}) * \Big((x_{1,i}, x_{2,i})_{0\leq i<k}\Big) \overset{(c)}{\in} H_A * \mathfrak{X} = H_B,$$

where (a) follows from (14), (b) follows from the definition of π_1 and π_2 and (c) follows from the fact that $(x_1, x_{2,A}) \in H_A$ and $(x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}) \in X_i$ for every $0 \leq i < k$.

We conclude that $\pi_1(x_1) \in P_{1|x_{2,B}}(H_B) = B$ for every $x_1 \in A$. Therefore, $\pi_1(A) \subset B$, which implies that $|A| \overset{(a)}{=} |\pi_1(A)| \leq |B|$, where (a) follows from the fact that π_1 is a permutation. By exchanging the roles of A and B we can also get $|B| \leq |A|$ which implies that $|A| = |B|$. We conclude that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a balanced partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$ as Lemma 26 already showed that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a partition. A similar argument shows that $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ is a balanced partition of $\mathcal{X}_2$. ■

Lemma 28. *For every $i \geq 0$ and every $A \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1}$, there exists $B \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ such that $A \subset B$.*

Proof: We will prove the lemma by induction on $i \geq 0$. The lemma is trivial for $i = 0$.

Now let $i > 0$ and suppose that the lemma is true for $i - 1$. Let $A \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1}$, there exist $A', A'' \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{(i-1)*_1}$ such that $A = A' *_1 A''$. From the induction hypothesis, there exist $B', B'' \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*})$ such that $A' \subset B'$ and $A'' \subset B''$. This means that there exist $H', H'' \in \mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*}$ and $x'_2, x''_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2$ such that $B' = P_{1|x'_2}(H')$ and $B'' = P_{1|x''_2}(H'')$. We have:

$$A = A' *_1 A'' \subset B' *_1 B'' = P_{1|x'_2}(H') *_1 P_{1|x''_2}(H'') \overset{(a)}{\subset} P_{1|x'_2 *_2 x''_2}(H' * H''),$$

where (a) follows from the fact that for every $x'_1 \in P_{1|x'_2}(H')$ and $x''_1 \in P_{1|x''_2}(H'')$, we have $(x'_1, x'_2) \in H'$ and $(x''_1, x''_2) \in H''$, and so $(x'_1 *_1 x''_1, x'_2 *_2 x''_2) = (x'_1, x'_2) * (x''_1, x''_2) \in H' * H''$, which implies that $x'_1 *_1 x''_1 \in P_{1|x'_2 *_2 x''_2}(H' * H'')$.

If we define $B = P_{1|x'_2 *_2 x''_2}(H' * H'') \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$, we get $A \subset B$. We conclude that the lemma is true for all $i \geq 0$. ■

Lemma 29. *$\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$) is a stable partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}_2$) of period at most $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, for every $i \geq 0$, we have $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})^{i*_2} = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$.*

Proof: We will only prove the lemma for $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ since the proof for $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ is similar.

Let $p = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$. According to Lemma 28, for every $A \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{p*_1}$, there exists $B \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{p*}) = \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ such that $A \subset B$. On the other hand, we have:

$$|A| \geq ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{p*_1}||_\wedge \overset{(a)}{\geq} ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})||_\wedge \overset{(b)}{=} ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})|| = |B|,$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 2 and (b) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a balanced partition (Lemma 27). We conclude that $A = B \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ since $|A| \geq |B|$ and $A \subset B$. Now since this is true for every $A \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{p*_1}$, we have $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{p*_1} \subset \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ which implies that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{p*_1} = \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ since $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{p*_1}$ is an $\mathcal{X}_1$-cover. We conclude that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a stable partition of period at most $p = \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$. Now since this is true for every stable partition and since $\mathcal{H}^{i*}$ is a stable partition for every $i \geq 0$, we conclude that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ is a stable partition for every $i \geq 0$. This implies $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})^{j*_1}$ is a stable partition for every $i \geq 0$ and every $j \geq 0$.

For every $i > 0$, Lemma 28 (applied to $\mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*}$) implies that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*})^{*_1}$ is a sub-stable partition of $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ and so $||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*})|| = ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{(i-1)*})^{*_1}|| \leq ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})||$. Therefore,

$$||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})|| \leq ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^*)|| \leq \dots \leq ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{p*})|| = ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})||.$$

We conclude that $||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})|| = ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{(i \bmod p)*})|| = ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})||$ for every $i \geq 0$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is stable, we have $||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1}|| = ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})||$, which implies that $||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1}|| = ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})||$ for every $i \geq 0$.

Now for every $i \geq 0$, $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1}$ is a sub-stable partition of $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ (by Lemma 28) and we have just shown that $||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1}|| = ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})||$. We conclude that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ for every $i \geq 0$. ■

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 4:

Proof of Theorem 4: Lemma 29 shows that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ are stable partitions of $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ respectively, and Lemma 25 shows that $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ are stable partitions of $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ respectively. Moreover, Lemma 29 shows that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})^{i*_2} = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ for every $i > 0$, and Lemma 25 shows that $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ and $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})^{i*_2} = \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$ for every $i > 0$.

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) \preceq \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}) \preceq \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$. Now we turn to show that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}) \preceq \mathcal{H} \preceq \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$. Let $A \times B \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ (i.e., $A \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $B \in \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$), and fix $x_1 \in A$ and $x_2 \in B$. Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $(x_1, x_2) \in H$. We have $x_1 \in P_{1|x_2}(H)$ as $(x_1, x_2) \in H$. Therefore, $P_{1|x_2}(H) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ which implies that $A = P_{1|x_2}(H)$ since both A and $P_{1|x_2}(H)$ are in $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ which was shown to be a stable partition.

Now fix $(x_A, x_B) \in A \times B$. Since $x_A \in A = P_{1|x_2}(H)$, we have $(x_A, x_2) \in H$ which means that $x_2 \in P_{2|x_A}(H)$. Therefore, $B \cap P_{2|x_A}(H) \neq \emptyset$ which implies that $B = P_{2|x_A}(H)$ since both B and $P_{2|x_A}(H)$ are in $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ which was shown to be a stable partition. Now since $x_B \in B = P_{2|x_A}(H)$, we conclude that $(x_A, x_B) \in H$. But this is true for all $(x_A, x_B) \in A \times B$, hence $A \times B \subset H$. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}) \preceq \mathcal{H}$.

In order to prove that $\mathcal{H} \preceq \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$, let $H \in \mathcal{H}$, $A' = P_1(H) \in \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $B' = P_2(H) \in \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$. Clearly, $H \subset A' \times B'$, hence $\mathcal{H} \preceq \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$.

Now let $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}) \preceq \mathcal{H}$, there exist an integer $n_H > 0$ and n_H sets $H_1, \ldots, H_{n_H} \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ such that $H_1, \ldots, H_{n_H}$ are disjoint and $H = H_1 \cup \ldots \cup H_{n_H}$. Since $H_1, \ldots, H_{n_H} \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$, there exist n_H sets $H_{1,1}, \ldots, H_{1,n_H} \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and n_H sets $H_{2,1}, \ldots, H_{2,n_H} \in \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ such that $H_1 = H_{1,1} \times H_{2,1}$, ..., and $H_{n_H} = H_{1,n_H} \times H_{2,n_H}$. Clearly, $H_{1,i} = P_1(H_i)$ and $H_{2,i} = P_2(H_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n_H$. We have:

- $H_{1,1} \cup \ldots \cup H_{1,n_H} = P_1(H_1) \cup \ldots \cup P_1(H_{n_H}) = P_1(H_1 \cup \ldots \cup H_{n_H}) = P_1(H) \in \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$.
- $H_{2,1} \cup \ldots \cup H_{2,n_H} = P_2(H_1) \cup \ldots \cup P_2(H_{n_H}) = P_2(H_1 \cup \ldots \cup H_{n_H}) = P_2(H) \in \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$.
- Suppose that $H_{1,i} = H_{1,j}$ for some $i \neq j$ and let $x_1 \in H_{1,i} = H_{1,j}$, then $H_{2,i} \cup H_{2,j} \subset P_{2|x_1}(H) \in \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ which cannot happen unless $H_{2,i} = H_{2,j} = P_{2|x_1}(H)$. This is a contradiction since $(H_{1,i} \times H_{2,i})$ and $(H_{1,j} \times H_{2,j})$ are disjoint. We conclude that $H_{1,1}, \ldots, H_{1,n_H}$ are disjoint. Similarly, $H_{2,1}, \ldots, H_{2,n_H}$ are also disjoint.

Now since $H_{1,1}, \ldots, H_{1,n_H}$ are disjoint, we have $||\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})|| = |P_1(H)| = |H_{1,1}| + \ldots + |H_{1,n_H}| = n_H||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})||$. Therefore, $n_H = \frac{||\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})||}{||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})||}$. Similarly, $n_H = \frac{||\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})||}{||\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})||}$. We conclude that n_H is the same for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Let us denote this common integer as n. It is now easy to see that $||\mathcal{H}|| = n \cdot ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})|| \cdot ||\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})|| = ||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})|| \cdot ||\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})|| = ||\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})|| \cdot ||\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})||$.

Now in order to prove the uniqueness of $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$, suppose that $\mathcal{H}_1$, $\mathcal{H}_2$, $\mathcal{H}'_1$, $\mathcal{H}'_2$, and $n' > 0$ satisfy the conditions of the theorem (i.e. $\mathcal{H}_1$, $\mathcal{H}_2$, $\mathcal{H}'_1$, $\mathcal{H}'_2$ and n' play the roles of $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ and n respectively). Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$, then there exist n' disjoint sets $H'_{1,1}, \ldots, H'_{1,n'} \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and n' disjoint sets $H'_{2,1}, \ldots, H'_{2,n'} \in \mathcal{H}_2$ such that:

- $H'_{1,1} \cup \ldots \cup H'_{1,n'} \in \mathcal{H}'_1$.
- $H'_{2,1} \cup \ldots \cup H'_{2,n'} \in \mathcal{H}'_2$.
- $H = (H'_{1,1} \times H'_{2,1}) \cup \ldots \cup (H'_{1,n'} \times H'_{2,n'})$.

Since $H = (H'_{1,1} \times H'_{2,1}) \cup \ldots \cup (H'_{1,n'} \times H'_{2,n'})$, we have $P_1(H) = H'_{1,1} \cup \ldots \cup H'_{1,n'} \in \mathcal{H}'_1$. But this is true for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{H}'_1$ which implies that $\mathcal{H}'_1 = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ since $\mathcal{H}'_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ are partitions. Similarly, $\mathcal{H}'_2 = \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$.

Now let $x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2$ be such that $P_{1|x_2}(H) \neq \emptyset$. Clearly, $x_2 \in H'_{2,i}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n'$ and so $P_{1|x_2}(H) = H'_{1,i} \in \mathcal{H}_1$ since $H = (H'_{1,1} \times H'_{2,1}) \cup \ldots \cup (H'_{1,n'} \times H'_{2,n'})$ and since $H'_{2,1}, \ldots, H'_{2,n'}$ are disjoint. Therefore, for every $x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2$ satisfying $P_{1|x_2}(H) \neq \emptyset$, we have $P_{1|x_2}(H) \in \mathcal{H}_1$. We conclude that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{H}_1$ which implies that $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ since $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ are partitions. Similarly, $\mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, $n' = \frac{||\mathcal{H}'_1||}{||\mathcal{H}_1||} = \frac{||\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})||}{||\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})||} = n$.

We conclude that the stable partitions $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ are unique. ■

Theorem 4 shows that the stable partitions of the product of two ergodic operations have a very particular structure. This structure will be useful to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 5. *Let $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ be $m \geq 2$ binary operations on $\mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_m$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_m$ and $* = *_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$. Then $*$ is strongly ergodic if and only if $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ are strongly ergodic.*

We will first prove Theorem 5 for $m = 2$ using two lemmas. The general result can then be proven by induction on $m \geq 2$.

Lemma 30. *If $* = *_1 \otimes *_2$ is a strongly ergodic operation on $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$, then $*_1$ and $*_2$ are strongly ergodic.*

Proof: Let $\mathcal{H}_1$ be a stable partition of $\mathcal{X}_1$, then $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \{\mathcal{X}_2\}$ is a stable partition of $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$. Fix $x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2$ and let $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$. Since $*$ is strongly ergodic, there exists $n = n(x_1, x_2, \mathcal{H}) > 0$ such that for any $H \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < n}$ satisfying $(x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X} = H$. Let $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1^{n*_1}$. Clearly, $H_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1^{n*_1} \otimes \{\mathcal{X}_2\} = (\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \{\mathcal{X}_2\})^{n*} = \mathcal{H}^{n*}$.

Since $H_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \in \mathcal{H}^{n*}$, there exists an $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X} = (X_i)_{0 \leq i < n}$ such that $(x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X} = H_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$. For every $0 \leq i < n$, $X_i \in (\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \{\mathcal{X}_2\})^{i*} = \mathcal{H}_1^{i*_1} \otimes \{\mathcal{X}_2\}$ and so there exists $X_{1,i} \in \mathcal{H}_1^{i*_1}$ such that $X_i = X_{1,i} \times \mathcal{X}_2$. By projecting the equation $(x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X} = H_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ on the first coordinate, we get $x_1 *_1 \mathfrak{X}_1 = H_1$, where $\mathfrak{X}_1$ is the $\mathcal{H}_1$-sequence $(X_{1,i})_{0 \leq i < n}$. By fixing $x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2$, n will depend only on x_1 and $\mathcal{H}_1$ as required in the definition of strong ergodicity. This proves that $*_1$ is strongly ergodic. A similar argument shows that $*_2$ is also strongly ergodic. ■

Lemma 31. *If $*_1$ and $*_2$ are two strongly ergodic operations on $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ respectively, then $* = *_1 \otimes *_2$ is a strongly ergodic operation on $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$.*

Proof: Fix a stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{X}$. Since $*_1$ and $*_2$ are strongly ergodic, they are ergodic and so Theorem 4 can be applied. Let $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ be defined as in Theorem 4, and let P_1 and P_2 be the projection onto the first and second coordinate respectively as in Definition 20.

Let $(x_1, x_2) \in H \in \mathcal{H}$. We will construct an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}$ satisfying $H \subset (x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}$ in two steps: We first construct an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}_U$ such that $P_1(H) \subset P_1\big((x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}_U\big)$, i.e., $\mathfrak{X}_U$ stretches $\{(x_1, x_2)\}$ in the direction of the first coordinate to cover $P_1(H)$. In the second step, we construct an $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}_L$ such that $H \subset \big((x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}_U\big) * \mathfrak{X}_L$, i.e., $\mathfrak{X}_L$ stretches $(x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}_U$ in the direction of the second coordinate to cover H.

Step 1: Let $H_1 = P_1(H) \in \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$. Since $*_1$ is strongly ergodic, there exists a $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}_1$ such that $x_1 *_1 \mathfrak{X}_1 = H_1$. Let $\mathfrak{X}_1' = (X_{1,i}')_{0 \leq i < k'} = (\mathfrak{X}_1)^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})}$. For every $0 \leq i < k' = |\mathfrak{X}_1'|$, we have $X_{1,i}' \in \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})^{i*_1} = \mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$, and so from Definition 20 there exists $X_i' \in \mathcal{H}^{i*}$ such that $P_1(X_i') = X_{1,i}'$. Define the $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}_U' = (X_i')_{0 \leq i < k'}$. The sequence $\mathfrak{X}_U'$ is $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable since $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ divides $|\mathfrak{X}_U'| = k' = |\mathfrak{X}_1| \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$. By Lemma 4, there exists $l > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{X}_U := (\mathfrak{X}_U')^l$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &\overset{(a)}{\subset} H_1 *_1 (\mathfrak{X}_1)^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})l-1} = (x_1 *_1 \mathfrak{X}_1) *_1 (\mathfrak{X}_1)^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})l-1} = x_1 *_1 (\mathfrak{X}_1)^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})l} = x_1 *_1 (\mathfrak{X}_1')^l \\ &= x_1 *_1 \big((X_{1,i}')_{0 \leq i < k'}\big)^l = P_1\big((x_1, x_2)\big) *_1 \Big(\big(P_1(X_i')\big)_{0 \leq i < k'}\Big)^l = P_1\Big((x_1, x_2) * \big((X_i')_{0 \leq i < k'}\big)^l\Big) \\ &= P_1\big((x_1, x_2) * (\mathfrak{X}_U')^l\big) = P_1\big((x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}_U\big), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $\mathfrak{X}_1$ is $\mathcal{U}_1(\mathcal{H})$-augmenting.

Step 2: Define $X_U = (x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}_U$. Since $\mathfrak{X}_U$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting, we must have $X_U \subset K$, where $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is such that $(x_1, x_2) \in K$ (see Theorem 1). Now since $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a sub-stable partition of $\mathcal{H}$ and since $(x_1, x_2) \in K \cap H$, we must have $K \subset H$. Therefore, $X_U \subset H$. On the other hand, from (15) we

have $H_1 \subset P_1(X_U)$. We conclude that for every $a \in H_1$, we have $a \in P_1(X_U)$ and so there exists $b_a \in \mathcal{X}_2$ such that $(a, b_a) \in X_U \subset H$.

According to Theorem 4, there exist n disjoint sets $H_{1,1}, \ldots, H_{1,n} \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and n disjoint sets $H_{2,1}, \ldots, H_{2,n} \in \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$ such that $H = (H_{1,1} \times H_{2,1}) \cup \ldots \cup (H_{1,n} \times H_{2,n})$. For every $a \in H_1 = H_{1,1} \cup \ldots \cup H_{1,n}$, there exists a unique $1 \leq i_a \leq n$ such that $a \in H_{1,i_a}$. We have:

$$H = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} (H_{1,i} \times H_{2,i}) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \bigcup_{a \in H_{1,i}} (\{a\} \times H_{2,i}) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \bigcup_{a \in H_{1,i}} (\{a\} \times H_{2,i_a}) = \bigcup_{a \in H_1} (\{a\} \times H_{2,i_a}). \quad (16)$$

Fix $a \in H_1$. Since $(a, b_a) \in H = \bigcup_{a' \in H_1} (\{a'\} \times H_{2,i_{a'}})$, we must have $b_a \in H_{2,i_a} \in \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$. Now since $*_2$ is strongly ergodic, there exists an $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$-augmenting sequence $\mathfrak{X}_{2,a}$ such that $b_a *_2 \mathfrak{X}_{2,a} = H_{2,i_a}$. Let $\mathfrak{X}'_{2,a} = (X'_{2,a,i})_{0 \leq i < k'_a} = (\mathfrak{X}_{2,a})^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})}$. For every $0 \leq i < k'_a$, we have $X'_{2,a,i} \in \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})^{i*_2} = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^{i*})$, and so from Definition 21 there exist $x'_{1,a,i} \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and $X'_{a,i} \in \mathcal{H}^{i*}$ such that $X'_{2,a,i} = P_{2|x'_{1,a,i}}(X'_{a,i})$. Define the $\mathcal{H}$-sequence $\mathfrak{X}'_a = (X'_{a,i})_{0 \leq i < k'_a}$. The sequence $\mathfrak{X}'_a$ is $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable since $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$ divides $|\mathfrak{X}'_a| = k'_a = |\mathcal{X}_{2,a}| \cdot \mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H})$.

Define the mapping $\pi_a : \mathcal{X}_1 \to \mathcal{X}_1$ as $\pi_a(x) = (((x *_1 x'_{1,a,0}) *_1 x'_{1,a,1}) \ldots *_1 x'_{1,a,k'_a-1})$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$. Since π_a is a permutation, there exists $p_a > 0$ such that $\pi_a^{p_a}(x) = x$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$. $(\mathfrak{X}'_a)^{p_a}$ is $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable since $\mathfrak{X}'_a$ is $\mathcal{H}$-repeatable. Now by Lemma 4 there exists $l_a > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{X}_a := (\mathfrak{X}'_a)^{p_a l_a}$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{a\} \times H_{2,i_a} &\overset{(a)}{\subset} \{a\} \times \left(H_{2,i_a} *_2 (\mathfrak{X}_{2,a})^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) p_a l_a - 1}\right) = \{a\} \times \left((b_a *_2 \mathfrak{X}_{2,a}) *_2 (\mathfrak{X}_{2,a})^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) p_a l_a - 1}\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \{\pi_a^{p_a l_a}(a)\} \times \left(b_a *_2 (\mathfrak{X}_{2,a})^{\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{H}) p_a l_a}\right) = \{\pi_a^{p_a l_a}(a)\} \times \left(b_a *_2 (\mathfrak{X}'_{2,a})^{p_a l_a}\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} (a, b_a) * \left(\left(\{x'_{1,a,i}\} \times X'_{2,a,i}\right)_{0 \leq i < k_a}\right)^{p_a l_a} \overset{(d)}{\subset} (a, b_a) * \left((X'_{a,i})_{0 \leq i < k_a}\right)^{p_a l_a} \\
&= (a, b_a) * (\mathfrak{X}'_a)^{p_a l_a} = (a, b_a) * \mathfrak{X}_a.
\end{aligned}$$

(a) follows from the fact that $\mathfrak{X}_{2,a}$ is $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H})$-augmenting. (b) follows from the fact that $\pi_a^{p_a}(x) = x$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$, which implies that $\pi_a^{p_a l_a}(a) = a$. (c) follows from the definition of π_a and from the fact that $\mathfrak{X}'_{2,a} = (X'_{2,a,i})_{0 \leq i < k_a}$. (d) follows from the fact that $P_{2|x'_{1,a,i}}(X'_{a,i}) = X'_{2,a,i}$, which implies that $\{x'_{1,a,i}\} \times X'_{2,a,i} \subset X'_{a,i}$ for every $0 \leq i < k_a$.

Now let $\mathfrak{X}_L = (\mathfrak{X}_a)_{a \in H_1}$ be the $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequence obtained by concatenating the $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting sequences $\mathfrak{X}_a$ for all $a \in H_1$ (the order of the concatenation is not important). Since $\{a\} \times H_{2,i_a} \subset (a, b_a) * \mathfrak{X}_a$ for every $a \in H_1$, we must have

$$\{a\} \times H_{2,i_a} \subset (a, b_a) * \mathfrak{X}_L \text{ for every } a \in H_1. \quad (17)$$

Define $\mathfrak{X} = (\mathfrak{X}_U, \mathfrak{X}_L)$. We have $(x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X} = \left((x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}_U\right) * \mathfrak{X}_L = X_U * \mathfrak{X}_L$. For every $a \in H_1$, we have already shown that $(a, b_a) \in X_U$ and so it follows from (17) that:

$$\{a\} \times H_{2,i_a} \subset (a, b_a) * \mathfrak{X}_L \subset X_U * \mathfrak{X}_L = (x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}.$$

Since this is true for every $a \in H_1$, we have:

$$H \overset{(a)}{=} \bigcup_{a \in H_1} \{a\} \times H_{2,i_a} \subset (x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X},$$

where (a) follows from (16).

Now since $\mathfrak{X}$ is $\mathcal{H}$-augmenting, Theorem 1 implies that $(x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X} \subset K$, where $K \in \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}$ is such that $(x_1, x_2) \in K$. Therefore, $||\mathcal{H}|| = |H| \leq |(x_1, x_2) * \mathfrak{X}| \leq |K| = ||\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}||$. Now since $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H}$ is a sub-stable partition of $\mathcal{H}$, we conclude that $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}$. But this is true for every stable partition $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{X}$, hence $*$ is strongly ergodic. ■

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 5:

Proof of Theorem 5: Lemmas 30 and 31 show that Theorem 5 is true for $m = 2$. Now let $m > 2$ and suppose that the theorem is true for $m - 1$.

Let $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ be m binary operations such that $*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$ is strongly ergodic. It is easy to see that $*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$ can be identified to $(*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_{m-1}) \otimes *_m$ (see Notation 6 below). Therefore, $(*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_{m-1}) \otimes *_m$ is strongly ergodic. Lemma 30 implies that $*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_{m-1}$ and $*_m$ are strongly ergodic. It then follows from the induction hypothesis that $*_1, \ldots, *_{m-1}$ are strongly ergodic. Therefore, $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ are strongly ergodic.

Conversely, let $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ be m strongly ergodic operations. From the induction hypothesis, we get that $*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_{m-1}$ is strongly ergodic. Lemma 31 implies that $(*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_{m-1}) \otimes *_m$ is strongly ergodic. But since $(*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_{m-1}) \otimes *_m$ can be identified to $*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$, we conclude that $*_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$ is strongly ergodic.

Therefore, Theorem 5 is true for all $m \geq 2$. ■

Notation 6. *Let $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ be $m \geq 2$ ergodic operations on $\mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_m$ respectively. Define $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_m$ and $* = *_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$. Let $A = \{i_1, \ldots, i_{|A|}\}$ and $B = \{j_1, \ldots, j_{|B|}\}$ be two non-empty subsets of $I_m := \{1, \ldots, m\}$ which form a non-trivial partition (i.e., $A \cup B = I_m$, $A \cap B = \emptyset$, $A \neq \emptyset$ and $B \neq \emptyset$). Define $\mathcal{X}_A = \mathcal{X}_{i_1} \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_{i_{|A|}}$, $\mathcal{X}_B = \mathcal{X}_{j_1} \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_{j_{|B|}}$, $*_A = *_{i_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes *_{i_{|A|}}$ and $*_B = *_{j_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes *_{j_{|B|}}$. Define the mapping $f_{A,B} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}_A \times \mathcal{X}_B$ as $f_{A,B}(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \big((x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_{|A|}}), (x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_{|B|}})\big)$. Clearly, $f_{A,B}$ is a bijection. We call $f_{A,B}$ the* canonical bijection *between $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}_A \times \mathcal{X}_B$. Throughout this paper, we identify $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ with $(\mathcal{X}_A * \mathcal{X}_B, *_A \otimes *_B)$ through the canonical bijection $f_{A,B}$.*

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$. Since $*_A$ and $*_B$ are ergodic, there are two unique stable partitions $\mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H}) \preceq \mathcal{U}_A(\mathcal{H})$ of $(\mathcal{X}_A, *_A)$ and two unique stable partitions $\mathcal{L}_B(\mathcal{H}) \preceq \mathcal{U}_B(\mathcal{H})$ of $(\mathcal{X}_B, *_B)$ and $n_A = \mathrm{cor}_{*_A,*_B}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathrm{cor}_{*_B,*_A}(\mathcal{H}) = n_B > 0$ satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4. We adopt the convention that $\mathcal{U}_{I_m}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{H}$.

If $A = \{i\}$ contains only one element i, we denote $\mathcal{L}_{\{i\}}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\{i\}}(\mathcal{H})$ by $\mathcal{L}_i(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_i(\mathcal{H})$ respectively.

Notation 7. *For each $A \subset B \subset I_m = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ we define the mapping $P_{B \to A} : \mathcal{X}_B \to \mathcal{X}_A$ as $P_{B\to A}(x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_{|B|}}) = (x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_{|A|}})$, where $A = \{i_1, \ldots, i_{|A|}\} \subset \{j_1, \ldots, j_{|B|}\} = B$. If A contains only one element i, we denote $P_{B\to\{i\}}$ by $P_{B\to i}$.*

Now for each $A \subsetneq B \subset I_m = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, each $x_{B\setminus A} \in \mathcal{X}_{B\setminus A}$ and each $X_B \subset \mathcal{X}_B$, we define the set $P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}(X_B) := \{x_A \in \mathcal{X}_A : \ (x_A, x_{B\setminus A}) \in X_B\} \subset \mathcal{X}_A$. If A contains only one element i, we denote $P_{B\to\{i\}|x_{B\setminus\{i\}}}(X_B)$ by $P_{B\to i|x_{B\setminus i}}(X_B)$.

It is easy to see that if $A \subset B \subset C \subset \{1, \ldots, m\}$ then we have $P_{B\to A} \circ P_{C\to B} = P_{C\to A}$. Similarly, if $A \subsetneq B \subsetneq C \subset \{1, \ldots, m\}$, then for each $X_C \in \mathcal{X}_C$, each $x_{C\setminus B} \in \mathcal{X}_{C\setminus B}$ and each $x_{B\setminus A} \in \mathcal{X}_{B\setminus A}$, we have $P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}\big(P_{C\to B|x_{C\setminus B}}(X_C)\big) = P_{C\to A|(x_{C\setminus B}, x_{B\setminus A})}(X_C)$. Here we have $(x_{C\setminus B}, x_{B\setminus A}) \in \mathcal{X}_{C\setminus A}$ since we are identifying $\mathcal{X}_{C\setminus A}$ with $\mathcal{X}_{C\setminus B} \times \mathcal{X}_{B\setminus A}$ through the canonical bijection.

Remark 17. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *) = (\mathcal{X}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_m, *_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m)$, where $*$ is ergodic. If $A \subset I_m = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, we have from Definition 20:*

$$\mathcal{U}_A(\mathcal{H}) = \{P_{I_m\to A}(H) : \ H \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

and if $A \subsetneq I_m = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, we have from Definition 21:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H}) &= \{P_{I_m\to A|x_{I_m\setminus A}}(H) : \ H \in \mathcal{H}, \ x_{I_m\setminus A} \in \mathcal{X}_{I_m\setminus A}, \ P_{I_m\to A|x_{I_m\setminus A}}(H) \neq \emptyset\} \\ &\overset{(a)}{=} \{P_{I_m\to A|x_{I_m\setminus A}}(H) : \ H \in \mathcal{H}, \ x_{I_m\setminus A} \in P_{I_m\to I_m\setminus A}(H)\}.\end{aligned}$$

(a) follows from the fact that $P_{I_m\to A|x_{I_m\setminus A}}(H) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $x_{I_m\setminus A} \in P_{I_m\to I_m\setminus A}(H)$.

Proposition 11. *Let $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ be $m \geq 2$ ergodic operations on $\mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_m$ respectively. Define $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_m$ and $* = *_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ and $A \subsetneq B \subsetneq I_m = \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Then $\mathcal{L}_A\big(\mathcal{L}_B(\mathcal{H})\big) = \mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_A\big(\mathcal{U}_B(\mathcal{H})\big) = \mathcal{U}_A(\mathcal{H})$.*

Proof: From Remark 17 we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}_A\big(\mathcal{U}_B(\mathcal{H})\big) &= \{P_{B\to A}(H_B):\ H_B \in \mathcal{U}_B(\mathcal{H})\} = \big\{P_{B\to A}\big(P_{I_m\to B}(H)\big):\ H\in\mathcal{H}\big\}\\ &= \{P_{I_m\to A}(H):\ H\in\mathcal{H}\} = \mathcal{U}_A(\mathcal{H}).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_A\big(\mathcal{L}_B(\mathcal{H})\big) &\overset{(a)}{=} \{P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}(H_B):\ H_B\in\mathcal{L}_B(\mathcal{H}),\ x_{B\setminus A}\in\mathcal{X}_{B\setminus A},\ P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}(H_B)\neq o\}\\ &\overset{(b)}{=} \Big\{P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}\big(P_{I_m\to B|x_{I_m\setminus B}}(H)\big):\ H\in\mathcal{H},\ x_{I_m\setminus B}\in\mathcal{X}_{I_m\setminus B},\ P_{I_m\to B|x_{I_m\setminus B}}(H)\neq\emptyset,\\ &\qquad\qquad x_{B\setminus A}\in\mathcal{X}_{B\setminus A},\ P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}\big(P_{I_m\to B|x_{I_m\setminus B}}(H)\big)\neq o\Big\}\\ &\overset{(c)}{=} \Big\{P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}\big(P_{I_m\to B|x_{I_m\setminus B}}(H)\big):\ H\in\mathcal{H},\ x_{I_m\setminus B}\in\mathcal{X}_{I_m\setminus B},\ x_{B\setminus A}\in\mathcal{X}_{B\setminus A},\\ &\qquad\qquad P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}\big(P_{I_m\to B|x_{I_m\setminus B}}(H)\big)\neq o\Big\}\\ &\overset{(d)}{=} \Big\{P_{I_m\to A|(x_{I_m\setminus B},x_{B\setminus A})}(H):\ H\in\mathcal{H},\ x_{I_m\setminus B}\in\mathcal{X}_{I_m\setminus B},\ x_{B\setminus A}\in\mathcal{X}_{B\setminus A},\\ &\qquad\qquad P_{I_m\to A|(x_{I_m\setminus B},x_{B\setminus A})}(H)\neq\emptyset\Big\}\\ &\overset{(e)}{=} \{P_{I_m\to A|x_{I_m\setminus A}}(H):\ H\in\mathcal{H},\ x_{I_m\setminus A}\in\mathcal{X}_{I_m\setminus A},\ P_{I_m\to A|x_{I_m\setminus A}}(H)\neq o\} = \mathcal{L}_A(\mathcal{H}).\end{aligned}$$

(a) and (b) follow from Remark 17. (c) follows from the fact that $P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}\big(P_{I_m\to B|x_{I_m\setminus B}}(H)\big)\neq\emptyset$ entails $P_{I_m\to B|x_{I_m\setminus B}}(H)\neq\emptyset$. (d) follows from the fact that $P_{B\to A|x_{B\setminus A}}\big(P_{I_m\to B|x_{I_m\setminus B}}(H)\big) = P_{I_m\to A|(x_{I_m\setminus B},x_{B\setminus A})}(H)$. (e) follows from the fact that $I_m\setminus A = (I_m\setminus B)\cup(B\setminus A)$ and so $\mathcal{X}_{I_m\setminus A}$ is identified to $\mathcal{X}_{I_m\setminus B}\times\mathcal{X}_{B\setminus A}$. ■

Definition 22. *Let $*_1,\ldots,*_m$ be $m\geq 2$ ergodic operations on $\mathcal{X}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{X}_m$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{X}=\mathcal{X}_1\times\ldots\times\mathcal{X}_m$ and $*=*_1\otimes\ldots\otimes *_m$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X},*)$. The* canonical factorization *of $\mathcal{H}$ is the sequence $(\mathcal{H}_i)_{1\leq i\leq m}$ defined as:*

- $\mathcal{H}_m = \mathcal{U}_m(\mathcal{H})$.
- *For each $1\leq i<m$, $\mathcal{H}_i = \mathcal{U}_i\big(\mathcal{L}_{I_i}(\mathcal{H})\big)$, where $I_i=\{1,\ldots,i\}$.*

Lemma 32. *Let $*_1,\ldots,*_m$ be $m\geq 2$ ergodic operations on $\mathcal{X}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{X}_m$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{X}=\mathcal{X}_1\times\ldots\times\mathcal{X}_m$ and $*=*_1\otimes\ldots\otimes *_m$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X},*)$. If $(\mathcal{H}_i)_{1\leq i\leq m}$ is the canonical factorization of $\mathcal{H}$, then $(\mathcal{H}_i)_{1\leq i\leq m-1}$ is the canonical factorization of $\mathcal{L}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})$, where $I_{m-1}=\{1,\ldots,m-1\}$.*

Proof: For each $1\leq i\leq m$, define $I_i=\{1,\ldots,i\}$. Let $\{\mathcal{H}'_i\}_{1\leq i\leq m-1}$ be the canonical factorization of $\mathcal{U}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})$. We have:

- $\mathcal{H}'_{m-1} = \mathcal{U}_{m-1}\big(\mathcal{L}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})\big) = \mathcal{H}_{m-1}$.
- For each $1\leq i<m-1$, we have $\mathcal{H}'_i = \mathcal{U}_i\big(\mathcal{L}_{I_i}\big(\mathcal{L}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})\big)\big) \overset{(a)}{=} \mathcal{U}_i\big(\mathcal{L}_{I_i}(\mathcal{H})\big) = \mathcal{H}_i$, where (a) follows from Proposition 11.

■

Definition 23. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a partition of a set $\mathcal{X}$. A section of $\mathcal{H}$ is a subset $C\subset\mathcal{X}$ such that:*

- $|C| = \mathcal{H}$.
- *For each $H\in\mathcal{H}$, there exists a unique $x\in C$ such that $x\in H$. In other words, the mapping $\mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{H}}$, restricted to C, is a bijection between C and $\mathcal{H}$.*

Lemma 33. *Let $*_1$ and $*_2$ be two ergodic operations on $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{X}=\mathcal{X}_1\times\mathcal{X}_2$ and $*=*_1\otimes *_2$ (thus, $*$ is ergodic). Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $\mathcal{X}$. If C_1 and C_2 are sections of $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ respectively, then $C=C_1\times C_2$ is a section of $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof: Let $f_{C,\mathcal{H}} : C \to \mathcal{H}$ be the mapping $\mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{H}}$ restricted to C, i.e., $f_{C,\mathcal{H}}(x) = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ for every $x \in C$.

Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $I_2 = \{1, 2\}$. We have $P_{I_2 \to 2}(H) \in \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ by Remark 17. Now since C_2 is a section of $\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$, there exists a unique $x_2 \in C_2$ such that $x_2 \in P_{I_2 \to 2}(H)$.

Since $x_2 \in P_{I_2 \to 2}(H)$, we have $P_{I_2 \to 1|x_2}(H) \in \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ by Remark 17. But C_1 is a section of $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$, so there exists a unique $x_1 \in C_1$ such that $x_1 \in P_{I_2 \to 1|x_2}(H)$, which means that $(x_1, x_2) \in H$. Therefore, there exists $(x_1, x_2) \in C_1 \times C_2 = C$ such that $f_{C,\mathcal{H}}(x_1, x_2) = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{H}}(x_1, x_2) = H$. We conclude that $f_{C,\mathcal{H}}$ is surjective.

On the other hand, we have $|C| = |C_1 \times C_2| = |C_1| \cdot |C_2| = |\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})| \cdot |\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})| = |\mathcal{H}|$, where the last equality follows from Theorem 4. Therefore, $f_{C,\mathcal{H}}$ is bijective since $f_{C,\mathcal{H}} : C \to \mathcal{H}$ is surjective and $|C| = |\mathcal{H}|$. Hence, $C = C_1 \times C_2$ is a section of $\mathcal{H}$. ■

Proposition 12. *Let $*_1, \ldots, *_m$ be $m \geq 2$ ergodic operations on $\mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_m$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_m$ and $* = *_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes *_m$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stable partition of $(\mathcal{X}, *)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ be the canonical factorization of $\mathcal{H}$. We have:*

- $|\mathcal{H}| = |\mathcal{H}_1| \cdots |\mathcal{H}_m|$.
- *If C_i is a section of $\mathcal{H}_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$, then $C = C_1 \times \ldots \times C_m$ is a section of $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof: For each $1 \leq i \leq m$, we define $I_i = \{1, \ldots, i\}$. We will prove the proposition by induction on m. If $m = 2$, we have:

- $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{U}_1\big(\mathcal{L}_{I_1}(\mathcal{H})\big) = \mathcal{U}_1\big(\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})\big) = \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$.
- By Theorem 4, we have $|\mathcal{H}| = |\mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})| \cdot |\mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})| = |\mathcal{H}_1| \cdot |\mathcal{H}_2|$.
- If C_1 and C_2 are sections of $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{L}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{U}_2(\mathcal{H})$ respectively, then Lemma 33 shows that $C = C_1 \times C_2$ is a section of $\mathcal{H}$

Therefore the proposition is true for $m = 2$.

Now let $m > 2$ and suppose that the proposition is true for $m - 1$. By Lemma 32, $(\mathcal{H}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m-1}$ is the canonical factorization of $\mathcal{L}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})$. We have:

- $|\mathcal{H}| = |\mathcal{L}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})| \cdot |\mathcal{U}_m(\mathcal{H})| = |\mathcal{L}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})| \cdot |\mathcal{H}_m|$ by Theorem 4. On the other hand, we have $|\mathcal{L}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})| = |\mathcal{H}_1| \cdots |\mathcal{H}_{m-1}|$ from the induction hypothesis. Therefore, $|\mathcal{H}| = |\mathcal{H}_1| \cdots |\mathcal{H}_m|$.
- For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, let C_i be a section of $\mathcal{H}_i$. From the induction hypothesis we get that $C_1 \times \ldots \times C_{m-1}$ is a section of $\mathcal{L}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})$. Now since $C_1 \times \ldots \times C_{m-1}$ and C_m are sections of $\mathcal{L}_{I_{m-1}}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}_m(\mathcal{H})$ respectively, Lemma 33 implies that $C = C_1 \times \ldots \times C_m$ is a section of $\mathcal{H}$.

Therefore, the proposition is also true for m. We conclude that the proposition is true for every $m \geq 2$. ■

IX. Conclusion

An ergodic theory for binary operations was developed. This theory will be applied in Part II of this paper [1] to provide a foundation for polarization theory. We will show that a binary operation $*$ is polarizing if and only if it is uniformity preserving and $/^*$ is strongly ergodic. A natural question to ask is whether the strong ergodicity of the inverse operation implies the strong ergodicity of the operation itself. It is easy to see that a uniformity preserving operation is ergodic (resp. irreducible, quasigroup operation) if and only if its inverse is ergodic (resp. irreducible, quasigroup operation). We do not know whether the same is true for strong ergodicity.

The potential applications of the ergodic theory of binary operations might extend beyond polarization theory. The mathematical framework that is developed here is fairly general and might be useful to areas outside polarization and information theory.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Emre Telatar for enlightening discussions and for his helpful feedback on the paper.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Nasser, “Ergodic theory meets polarization. II: A foundation of polarization theory,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1406.2949, 2014. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.2949

[2] E. Arıkan, “Channel polarization: A method for constructing capacity-achieving codes for symmetric binary-input memoryless channels,” *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3051 –3073, 2009.

[3] E. Arıkan and E. Telatar, “On the rate of channel polarization,” in *Information Theory, 2009. ISIT 2009. IEEE International Symposium on*, 28 2009.

[4] E. Şaşoğlu, E. Telatar, and E. Arıkan, “Polarization for arbitrary discrete memoryless channels,” in *Information Theory Workshop, 2009. ITW 2009. IEEE*, 2009, pp. 144 –148.

[5] W. Park and A. Barg, “Polar codes for q-ary channels,,” *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 955–969, 2013.

[6] A. Sahebi and S. Pradhan, “Multilevel polarization of polar codes over arbitrary discrete memoryless channels,” in *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2011 49th Annual Allerton Conference on*, 2011, pp. 1718–1725.

[7] E. Şaşoğlu, “Polar codes for discrete alphabets,” in *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2012 IEEE International Symposium on*, 2012, pp. 2137–2141.

[8] R. Nasser and E. Telatar, “Polarization theorems for arbitrary DMCs,” in *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2013 IEEE International Symposium on*, 2013, pp. 1297–1301.

[9] ——, “Polar codes for arbitrary DMCs and arbitrary MACs,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1311.3123, 2013. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.3123